

Impact of Earthquakes on the Central USA

Appendices I - IX

Amr S. Elnashai Lisa J. Cleveland Theresa Jefferson John Harrald

Mid-America Earthquake Center Report 08-02

Project funded by Federal Emergency Management Agency Managed by US Army Corps of Engineers ERDC-CERL

Appendix I: Shaking Maps

This appendix details the development of shaking maps for all scenarios employed in the MAEC-GWU State reports for earthquake planning workshops in New Madrid Seismic Zone States. A total of ten scenarios have been completed and the sets of shaking maps used for these scenarios are included. HAZUS-MH MR2, the analytical loss assessment software used, requires four shaking parameters to perform an analysis. These parameters are peak ground acceleration (PGA), peak ground velocity (PGV), short-period spectral acceleration (S_a 0.3 sec.) and long-period spectral acceleration (S_a 1.0 sec.).

Each set of shaking maps is explained separately in following discussion. Most shaking maps were created by the USGS and modified by the MAEC. These modifications are quantified in this appendix. Shaking maps that were developed by the MAEC are also discussed and the creation process detailed.

At the conclusion of this appendix is a series of maps. Original USGS and MAEC adjusted maps are shown, for those scenarios that relied on USGS maps. All shaking maps created by the MAEC are also included.

Alabama – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Alabama employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along the southwest segment of the presumed New Madrid Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS for the middle fault in the proposed NMSZ. Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments: northeast, central and southwest. The worst case scenario for the State of Alabama, and the critical counties in particular, is an event on the eastern fault line in the southwest segment. The USGS southwest extension map is shifted from the middle fault to the eastern fault line according to the following parameters:

- Geographic coordinate system: GCS_North_America_1983
- Southwest Segment Eastern Fault Line
- Central Meridian: -92.7
- Scale Factor: 1.005

Portions of Alabama are not covered by the shifted maps and require the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by the shifted USGS map, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second

- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Original USGS shaking maps for the southwest extension event in the State of Alabama are illustrated in this appendix. Maps shifted to the eastern fault are also illustrated in this appendix.

Alabama – East Tennessee Seismic Zone Event

This earthquake impact assessment for the State of Alabama employs one scenario event in Dekalb County. The scenario consists of a M5.9 earthquake in the East Tennessee Seismic Zone (ETSZ). The epicenter location and all soil and liquefaction data are provided by the Geologic Survey of Alabama (GSA). The epicenter chosen for this scenario is located at 34.446N, 85.617W. A set of five attenuation functions is used to generate ground motion. The attenuations and weighting factors are listed below:

Atkinson and Boore (1997)	0.250
Toro, Abrahamson and Schneider (1997)	0.250
Frankel, Mueller, Barnhard, Perkins et al. (1996)	0.250
Campbell (2002)	0.125
Sommerville, Collins, Abrahamson et al. (2002)	0.125

It is relevant to note that the attenuation from Frankel, Mueller, Barnhard, Perkins et al. (1996) cannot be computed for a magnitude of 5.9. The attenuation only applies to earthquakes with magnitudes of 6.0 or greater. In order to determine regional ground shaking with this attenuation, a magnitude of 6.0 was used. The four remaining attenuations employed a magnitude 5.9, as prescribed by GSA. This change does not impact the intensity of regional shaking significantly and is acceptable for the purposes of this assessment. Shaking maps for this scenario are illustrated in this appendix.

Arkansas – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Arkansas employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along the southwest extension of the presumed New Madrid Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS for the middle fault in the proposed NMSZ. Based on the recommendation of the Arkansas State Geologic Survey, the southwest segment of the middle fault is taken to be the worst case scenario for the State of Arkansas, and no shifting of shaking maps is undertaken. Shaking maps for this scenario are illustrated in this appendix.

Portions of Arkansas are not covered by the USGSmaps and required the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by

these maps, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second
- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Illinois – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Illinois employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along the northern segment of the presumed New Madrid Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS for the middle fault in the proposed NMSZ. The worst case scenario for the State of Illinois, for the critical counties in particular, is an event on the western fault line in the northern segment. The USGS northeast extension shaking maps are shifted from the middle fault to the western fault line according to the following parameters:

- Geographic coordinate system: GCS_North_America_1983
- Northeast Segment Western Fault Line
- Central Meridian: -93.189
- Scale Factor: 0.994

Portions of Illinois are not covered by the shifted maps and required the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by the shifted USGS map, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second
- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Shaking maps for this scenario are illustrated in this appendix.

Indiana – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

This scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along the northeast segment of the NMSZ. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS for the middle fault in the proposed NMSZ. The NMSZ scenario for the State of Indiana employs an event in the northeast segment of the eastern fault. Original USGS shaking maps are illustrated in this appendix, while shifted shaking maps are also illustrated in

this appendix. Shaking maps are shifted from the middle fault to the eastern fault according to the following parameters:

- Geographic coordinate system: GCS_North_America_1983
- Northeast Segment Eastern Fault Line
- Central Meridian: -92.7
- Scale Factor: 1.003

Portions of Indiana are not covered by the shifted maps and required the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by the shifted USGS map, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second
- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Indiana – Wabash Valley Seismic Zone Event

This scenario consists of a M7.1 earthquake along the Wabash Valley Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS. The maps developed by the USGS cover the entire State of Indiana, and there is no need to assign shaking values as is carried out for other states. Wabash Valley Event shaking maps are illustrated in this appendix.

Kentucky – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

This earthquake impact assessment for the State of Kentucky employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS for the middle fault in the proposed NMSZ. The scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along one segment of the presumed New Madrid Fault system. The worst case scenario for the entire State of Kentucky is an event on the eastern fault line in the northeast segment. All USGS shaking maps for Kentucky are illustrated in this appendix and shifted maps are shown in this appendix. The USGS shaking maps are shifted from the middle fault to the eastern fault according to the following parameters:

- Geographic coordinate system: GCS_North_America_1983
- Northeast Segment Eastern Fault Line
- Central Meridian: -92.7
- Scale Factor: 1.003

Portions of Kentucky are not covered by the shifted maps and required the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by the shifted USGS map, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second
- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Mississippi – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

The scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along one segment of the NMSZ. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS for the middle fault in the proposed NMSZ. The NMSZ worst case scenario for the State of Mississippi employs an event in the southwest segment of the eastern fault. Shaking maps created by the USGS are illustrated in this appendix, while shifted maps for Mississippi are also depicted in this appendix. The original USGS maps are shifted to the eastern fault line according to the following parameters:

- Geographic coordinate system: GCS_North_America_1983
- Southwest Segment Eastern Fault Line
- Central Meridian: -92.7
- Scale Factor: 1.005

Portions of Mississippi are not covered by the shifted maps and required the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by the shifted USGS map, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second
- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Missouri – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Missouri employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along the central segment of the presumed New Madrid Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS for the middle fault in the proposed NMSZ. The worst case scenario for the State of Missouri is an event on the western fault line in the central segment. USGS maps for the middle fault are shown in this appendix, and shifted maps are also shown in this appendix. Original USGS shaking maps are shifted to the western fault according to the following parameters.

- Geographic coordinate system: GCS_North_America_1983
- Central Segment Western Fault Line
- Central Meridian: -93.53
- Scale Factor: 0.994

Portions of Missouri are not covered by the shifted maps and required the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by the shifted USGS map, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second
- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Tennessee – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Tennessee employs one scenario event along the NMSZ. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the USGS. The scenario consists of a M7.7 earthquake along one segment of the NMSZ. The worst case scenario for the State of Tennessee is an event on an eastern fault line associated with the southern segment. The USGS maps for the middle fault are illustrated in this appendix, while the shifted maps are also shown in this appendix. Original USGS maps are shifted to the eastern fault according to the following parameters:

- Geographic coordinate system: GCS_North_America_1983
- Southwest Segment Eastern Fault Line
- Central Meridian: -92.7
- Scale Factor: 1.005

Portions of Tennessee are not covered by the shifted maps and required the assignment of shaking values. Due to the low level of shaking experienced in the areas not covered by the shifted USGS map, the following values are applied to shaking parameters required by HAZUS-MH MR2:

- PGA: 5% of gravity
- PGV: 3 inches per second
- Spectral Acceleration @ 1 sec frequency: Set to 11% of gravity
- Spectral Acceleration @ 0.3 sec frequency: Set to 12% of gravity

Alabama PGA from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Alabama PGV from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Alabama Sa 0.3 Sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



















Mid-America Earthquake Center

University of lillio is at Urbana-Champaign, lillio is, USA Amir S. Elhashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator







University of lillhols at Urbana–Champaigh, lillhols, USA Amir S. Einashal, ProjectPrincipal investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal investigator



Arkansas PGV from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Mid-America Earthquake Center

University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champaign, Illiho b., USA Amir S. Elhasha I, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator





University of Illihois at Urbana-Champaigh, Illihois, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Arkansas Sa 0.3 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Mid-America Earthquake Center

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jeffeison, Principal Investigator



Arkansas Sa 0.3 sec. from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







University of lillino is at Urbana–Cham paign, lillino is, USA Amir S. Elhasha I, Project Principal Investigator There sa Jefferson, Principal Investigator









Mid-America Earthquake Center

University of lillhols at Urbana-Champaign, lillhols, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal investigator



Arkansas Sa 1.0 sec. from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champaign, Illiho b., USA Amir S. Elhasha I, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



Illinois PGA from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champa bju, Illiho bi, USA Amir S. Elha sha l, ProjectPirho ipali hvestiga to r Theresa Jefferson, Priho ipali hvestiga tor

Illinois PGA from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champa bju, Illiho bi, USA Amir S. Elha sha l, ProjectPirho ipali hvestiga to r Theresa Jefferson, Priho ipali hvestiga tor

Illinois PGV from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Illinois PGV from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Illinois Sa 0.3 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







Univershy of Illiho is at Urbana–Cham pa bjn, Illiho bi, USA Amir S. Elhasha i, ProjectPirho ipali hvestiga to r Theresa Jefferson, Priho ipali hvestiga to r

Illinois Sa 1.0 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Illinois Sa 1.0 sec. from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



University of Illiho is art Urbana–Cham pa bin, Illiho bi, USA Amir S. Elha sha i, ProjectPirho ipali investigato r There sa Jefferson, Principal investigator

Indiana PGA for USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event


Indiana PGA for MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Indiana PGV from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Indiana PGV from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Indiana Sa 0.3 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





iversity of lilling is at Urbana-Champaign, lilling is, U: Am r S. Elhashal, Project Principal investigator There sa Jefferson, Principal investigator

Indiana Sa 1.0 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Indiana Sa 1.0 sec. from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





hersity of lilho is at Urbana–Champa bin, lilho is, U Amir S. Ehashal, ProjectPincipal investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



University of illinois at Urbana-Champaign, illinois, USA Amir S. Einashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Indiana Sa 0.3 sec. - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event





Mid-America Earthquake Center

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Am r S. Elhashal, Project Principal Investigator There sa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Indiana Sa 1.0 sec. - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event





















Mississippi PGA from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





C Mid-America Earthquake Center



University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champaign, Illiho b., USA Amir S. Elhasha i, ProjectPinicipal Investigator Theresa Jeffelson, Principal Investigator

Mississippi PGA from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008





Legend

- 0.2 - 0.3

-0.3 - 0.4

- 0.5 - 0.6

0.6 - 0.7

- 0.9 - 1.0

— 1.0 - 1.1

0.7 - 0.8

Mid-America Earthquake Center

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Elhashal, Project Pincipal Investigator Theresa Jeffeison, Principal Investigator

Mississippi PGV from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





C Mid-America Earthquake Center



University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champa bji, Illiho bi, USA Amir S. Elha sha i, ProjectPinicipal Investigator Theresa Jeffeison, Principal Investigator

Mississippi PGV from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







Mid-America Earthquake Center



120

80

Miles

40

University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champaign, Illiho b., USA Amir S. Elhasha i, ProjectPincipal Investigator Theresa Jeffelson, Principal Investigator

Mississippi Sa 0.3 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Mid-America Earthquake Center



University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champaign, Illiho b., USA Amir S. Elhasha i, ProjectPincipal Investigator Theresa Jeffelson, Principal Investigator

Mississippi Sa 0.3 sec. from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008





Mid-America Earthquake Center



University of Illinois at Urbana-Champatan, Illinois, USA Am r S. Elhashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator







C Mid-America Earthquake Center



University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champaign, Illiho b., USA Amir S. Elhasha i, ProjectPincipal Investigator Theresa Jeffelson, Principal Investigator



April 2008





Mid-America Earthquake Center



University of lithois at Urbana-Champaign, lithois, USA Am r S. Elhashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Missouri PGA from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event









University of lillino is at Urbana–Champaign, lillino is, USA Amir S. Elnaska i, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Missouri PGA from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



University of lillinois at Urbana-Champaign, lillinois, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Missouri PGV from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event









University of lillino is at Urbana-Champaign, lillino it, USA Amir S. Einaskal, ProjectPrincipal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Missouri PGV from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Missouri Sa 0.3 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event









University of lillino is at Urbana–Champatjin, lillino is, USA Amir S. Elhashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Missouri Sa 0.3 sec. from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Missouri Sa 1.0 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event









University of lillino is at Urbana–Champatjn, lillino is, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Missouri Sa 1.0 sec. from MAEC - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







University of lilhois at Urbana-Champatju, lilhois, USA Amir S. Einashal, ProjectPirhoipal Investigator Theresa Jeffelson, Principal Investigator


erstly of Illho is at Urbana-Champaigh, Illho is, USA Amir S. Einashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jetterson, Principal Investigator



University of Illinois at Urbana-Champatyn, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Tennessee Sa 0.3 sec. from USGS - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator There sa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



Appendix II: Inventory

This appendix details the inventory employed in all State Reports. Inventory data used in state workshop scenarios is a combination of HAZUS-MH MR2 default data and 2007 Homeland Security Infrastructure Program (HSIP) datasets with additional inventory collected by the MAE Center for specific regions. The inventory required for a HAZUS-MH MR2 analysis is divided into numerous categories, some of which have been updated for the impact assessment provided for state workshops. The 'general building stock' defines all buildings in a state that are not related to transportation and utilities services. This dataset includes residential, commercial, industrial, government, education, religious, and agricultural buildings. These buildings are aggregated at the census tract level, meaning all buildings are summed by construction type and occupancy type independently for a given census tract. The general building stock was not updated for state workshop analyses due to a lack of refined data for the areas requiring assessment, so HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory was used here.

'Essential facilities' is a dataset that is broken out from the general building stock. These facilities include schools, hospitals, fire stations, police stations, and emergency operation centers and are separated from the general building stock due to their critical importance in rescue efforts following a natural disaster. Essential facilities information was updated with HSIP data for each facility type. Additional hospitals from HSIP data were added and classified by size (based on number of beds). Primary and secondary schools, as well as colleges and universities, were added to HAZUS-MH MR2 inventory and classified accordingly. Fire and police station datasets were supplemented with HSIP data as well. All new essential facilities taken from HSIP datasets were assigned the HAZUS-MH MR2 classifies all fire stations as unreinforced masonry, low-rise (URML) construction. Since structure type is not defined within the HSIP datasets, all fire stations added from that data were assigned the HAZUS-MH MR2 default structure type is not defined within the HSIP datasets, all fire stations added from that data were assigned the HAZUS-MH MR2 default structure type associated structure type URML. The same is true for all other essential facility types as follows:

- Schools, police stations, EOCs structure type: URML
- Hospital structure type: PC1

Additionally, replacement cost data was updated to reflect more current cost data. Eduardo Escalona, at the time working with FEMA VII, assisted the MAE Center with updates to essential facilities. For more detailed information on the updates to essential facilities, reference is made to Escalona.¹

The State of Illinois impact assessment also drew inventory data from a previous MAE Center project, SE-1, with Professors Steven French of the Georgia Institute of Technology and Robert Olshansky of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. This report includes essential

¹ Eduardo Escalona. (Formerly of FEMA Region VII) currently PBS&J.

facilities data for 23 counties in southern Illinois. For further information on the essential facilities data included in the State of Illinois impact assessment, please contact the MAE Center².

Transportation, utility, and high potential-loss facility (HPLF) datasets were also updated with HSIP data. The only exception to this is the potable water facility dataset. The HSIP critical infrastructure data does not include information on potable water facilities, and thus no updates to HAZUS-MH MR2 inventory were completed. Transportation, utility and HPLF inventory datasets were appended to include HSIP data. HAZUS-MH MR2 inventory was compared with HSIP data for each facility type and when the HSIP dataset reported more facilities than HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory, those additional facilities from the HSIP dataset were added to the HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory. This means that no facilities were deleted from HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory, but rather facilities were added to create the most comprehensive dataset available. Kirk Chesla of Innovative Emergency Management (IEM) assisted the MAE Center with inventory updates for transportation, utility, and HPLF facilities. More specifically datasets updated with HSIP data include:

- Transportation Systems
 - Highway Bridges
 - Railway Bridges
 - Ferry Facilities
 - Bus Stations
 - Airports
 - Light Rail Facilities and Bridges
- Utility Systems
 - Waste Water Facilities
 - Natural Gas Facilities
 - Major Natural Gas Transmission Pipelines
 - Oil Facilities
 - Major Oil Transmission Pipelines
 - Electric Power Facilities
 - Major Electric Transmission Lines
 - Communication Facilities
- High Potential-Loss Facilities
 - o Dams
 - Nuclear Power Facilities
 - Military Installations
 - Hazardous Materials Facilities

In addition, regional transmission lines for natural gas and oil were added from the HSIP 2007 data. Replacement costs were also added to these major natural gas and oil transmission lines. Pipeline inventory updates were also assisted by Eduardo Escalona (contact information above).

The following tables illustrate differences between HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory and the inventory updates completed for the State Reports. Infrastructure categories are listed by state.

² Mid-America Earthquake Center, SE-1 "Inventory of Essential Facilities in Mid-America." Contact Person: Timothy Gress, Phone: 217-244-6302, Email: <u>tgress@uiuc.edu</u>

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	122	137
Schools	1,857	1,870
Fire Stations	729	1,388
Police Stations	470	496
Emergency Operation Centers	27	27
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	11,857	14,597
Highway Tunnels	0	0
Railway Bridges	88	118
Railway Facilities	104	109
Railway Tunnel	0	9
Bus Facilities	16	24
Port Facilities	274	274
Ferry Facilities	0	6
Airports	180	469
Light Rail Facilities	0	0
Light Rail Bridges	0	0
Utility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	418	15,341
Electric Power Facilities	78	1,425
Natural Gas Facilities	81	368
Oil Facilities	17	112
Potable Water Facilities	30	30
Waste Water Facilities	299	410
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	2,101	2,220
Hazardous Materials Facilities	2,199	3,360
Levees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	3	3

Table 1: Alabama Inventory Comparison

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	93	103
Schools	1,059	1,254
Fire Stations	435	1,330
Police Stations	378	515
Emergency Operation Centers	11	11
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	5,634	5,634
Highway Tunnels	2	2
Railway Bridges	48	48
Railway Facilities	68	68
Railway Tunnel	0	0
Bus Facilities	16	16
Port Facilities	99	99
Ferry Facilities	1	1
Airports	216	314
Light Rail Facilities	0	0
Light Rail Bridges	0	0
Utility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	310	625
Electric Power Facilities	31	56
Natural Gas Facilities	97	97
Oil Facilities	10	10
Potable Water Facilities	69	69
Waste Water Facilities	411	411
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	1,173	1,173
Hazardous Materials Facilities	1,475	1,475
Levees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	1	1

Table 2: Arkansas Inventory Comparison

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	227	249
Schools	5,283	5,722
Fire Stations	1,007	1,725
Police Stations	866	1,044
Emergency Operation Centers	149	149
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	22,854	22,854
Highway Tunnels	0	0
Railway Bridges	963	1,030
Railway Facilities	285	285
Railway Tunnel	0	4
Bus Facilities	101	119
Port Facilities	438	514
Ferry Facilities	2	11
Airports	624	929
Light Rail Facilities	0	401
Light Rail Bridges	38	38
Utility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	518	34,833
Electric Power Facilities	153	2,172
Natural Gas Facilities	62	1,333
Oil Facilities	39	275
Potable Water Facilities	242	242
Waste Water Facilities	876	9,389
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	1,255	1,511
Hazardous Materials Facilities	4,870	7,249
Levees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	7	7

Table 3: Illinois Inventory Comparison

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	128	175
Schools	2,630	2,686
Fire Stations	605	1,210
Police Stations	502	474
Emergency Operation Centers	51	51
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	16,505	16,505
Highway Tunnels	0	0
Railway Bridges	80	92
Railway Facilities	91	91
Railway Tunnel	0	8
Bus Facilities	32	46
Port Facilities	84	91
Ferry Facilities	0	0
Airports	496	496
Light Rail Facilities	0	13
Light Rail Bridges	0	0
Utility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	386	21,679
Electric Power Facilities	54	792
Natural Gas Facilities	29	29
Oil Facilities	11	170
Potable Water Facilities	96	96
Waste Water Facilities	446	446
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	1,026	1,163
Hazardous Materials Facilities	3,793	3,793
Levees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	0	0

Table 4: Indiana Inventory Comparison

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	121	135
Schools	1,666	1,846
Fire Stations	625	1,066
Police Stations	381	407
Emergency Operation Centers	9	0
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	6,443	6,805
Highway Tunnels	4	4
Railway Bridges	143	166
Railway Facilities	117	117
Railway Tunnel	1	18
Bus Facilities	21	26
Port Facilities	277	301
Ferry Facilities	1	16
Airports	142	219
Light Rail Facilities	0	0
Light Rail Bridges	0	0
Utility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	374	16,357
Electric Power Facilities	68	1,693
Natural Gas Facilities	75	337
Oil Facilities	20	88
Potable Water Facilities	179	179
Waste Water Facilities	335	9,080
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	1,134	1,188
Hazardous Materials Facilities	2,060	2,830
Levees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	0	0

Table 5: Kentucky Inventory Comparison

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	105	123
Schools	1,124	1,281
Fire Stations	430	984
Police Stations	368	365
Emergency Operation Centers	37	37
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	13.692	16.936
Highway Tunnels	0	0
Railway Bridges	56	63
Railway Facilities	71	76
Railway Tunnel	1	1
Bus Facilities	27	40
Port Facilities	205	222
Ferry Facilities	0	2
Airports	192	256
Light Rail Facilities	0	0
Light Rail Bridges	0	0
Iltility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	299	9.216
Electric Power Facilities	32	748
Natural Gas Facilities	55	415
Oil Facilities	10	105
Potable Water Facilities	17	17
Waste Water Facilities	335	3,080
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	3 307	3 514
Hazardous Materials Facilities	1 154	1 939
l evees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	1	1

Table 6: Mississippi Inventory Comparison

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	143	160
Schools	2,863	2,817
Fire Stations	636	1,399
Police Stations	592	654
Emergency Operation Centers	33	33
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	21,765	21,765
Highway Tunnels	0	0
Railway Bridges	163	200
Railway Facilities	125	125
Railway Tunnel	0	12
Bus Facilities	62	72
Port Facilities	193	230
Ferry Facilities	1	8
Airports	401	558
Light Rail Facilities	0	17
Light Rail Bridges	0	0
Utility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	397	20,872
Electric Power Facilities	79	1,406
Natural Gas Facilities	9	354
Oil Facilities	10	119
Potable Water Facilities	187	8,599
Waste Water Facilities	1,312	1,312
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	4,108	5,265
Hazardous Materials Facilities	2,113	2,833
Levees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	1	1

Table 7: Missouri Inventory Comparison

Infrastructure Category	HAZUS MR2 Default Inventory	Updated Inventory
Essential Facilities		
Hospitals	135	180
Schools	1,973	2,309
Fire Stations	565	1,110
Police Stations	425	423
Emergency Operation Centers	36	0
Transportation Facilities		
Highway Bridges	5,298	7,215
Highway Tunnels	5	5
Railway Bridges	122	151
Railway Facilities	129	129
Railway Tunnel	0	15
Bus Facilities	35	51
Port Facilities	168	200
Ferry Facilities	1	6
Airports	184	315
Light Rail Facilities	0	25
Light Rail Bridges	0	0
Utility Facilities		
Communication Facilities	458	16,130
Electric Power Facilities	59	428
Natural Gas Facilities	56	183
Oil Facilities	21	121
Potable Water Facilities	98	98
Waste Water Facilities	504	1,946
High Potential Loss Facilities		
Dams	994	1,204
Hazardous Materials Facilities	2,489	4,006
Levees	0	0
Nuclear Power Facilities	2	2

Table 8: Tennessee Inventory Comparison

Appendix III: Fragility Relationships¹

Overview

Fragility relationships are a critical component of seismic impact assessment. The fragility, or vulnerability, functions relate the severity of shaking to the probability of reaching a level of damage (e.g. light, medium, extensive, near-collapse) to various infrastructure items. The level of shaking can be quantified using numerous shaking parameters, including peak ground acceleration, velocity, displacement, spectral acceleration, spectral velocity or spectral displacement. Each infrastructure item requires a corresponding set of fragilities to determine damage level likelihoods (probability). For example, medium span RC bridges will have 3 fragility relationships that yield the likelihood that a bridge will be lightly damaged, incur medium damage or be near collapse. All inventory categories provided in HAZUS-MH MR2 also include fragilities, termed 'default' fragilities for more accurate impact assessments. Due to the tight time line for the emergency response planning workshops for the 8 states, the HAZUS default fragilities were used throughout this study. Phase II of the current project will employ advanced fragilities based on analytical and physical simulations.

Each infrastructure type has a set of fragility functions—one for each damage level. HAZUS-MH MR2 specifies four damage levels: slight, moderate, extensive, and complete. Complete damage is most simply defined as being damaged beyond any state of repair. All other damage states vary between no damage up to complete damage, though descriptions for each infrastructure type differ based on the type of construction. When fragility functions are updated, the parameters for each of the four damage levels must be updated. Many default fragilities are based on expert opinion, and updating these with fragilities developed using analytical models will improve the accuracy of damage estimations. Since inventory and hazard improvements were the primary components of this series of Phase I analyses, fragility functions were not updated. Default fragilities are considered conservative since very little analytical work was done to generate most of them. As a result, improving fragilities does not always increase damage, as shown by Elnashai and Cleveland (2007).

Fragility Definition and Applications

In general, fragility functions relate a level of shaking, or system demand, to the conditional probability of a specific system reaching or exceeding a limit state response. Figure 1 illustrates typical fragility functions. A deterministic response, or the vertical line, indicates a lack of uncertainty in the system response. Fragility curves close to vertical indicate a low level of uncertainty (P1), while those with a much higher uncertainty are spread over a much wider range of shaking values (P2).

¹ This appendix heavily references the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Report (Mid-America Earthquake Center, 2007).

Derivation of useful functions requires the definition of limit states that are meaningful in the context of loss assessment. Selection and quantitative definition of limit states are central to the derivation of system vulnerability. With the limit states already defined, the limit state probability is given by:

$$P[LS] = \Sigma P[LS \mid D = d] P[D = d]$$
⁽¹⁾

Here D defines the random variable representing the demand of the system; P[LS|D=d] is the conditional limit state probability, given that D=d, and the summation taken over all values of D. The probability P[D=d] defines the hazard. The variable d is the control or interface variable.



Figure 1: Typical Fragility Function

The conditional probability, P[LS|D=d] = V(x), is the measure of vulnerability (Wen et al, 2003). The previous equation indicates a coupled probabilistic approach, meaning coupled with regard to the system resistance or limit states and demand imposed on the system. Conversely, uncoupled vulnerability analysis, indicating that relationships are derived which are independent of the site hazard, offer a number of attractive features, such as simplification of the derivations and avoidance of the need to define very low probability events (Wen et al, 2003).

Default HAZUS-MH MR2 Fragilities for Buildings

HAZUS-MH MR2 classifies buildings into 36 different types based on the building material and structural system employed in the building's construction. A summary of building types is illustrated in Table 1, while more detailed descriptions are provided the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual (FEMA-NIBS, 2006). The inventory in the regions considered in the NMSZ analysis only includes 16 of these 36 building types. Mid-rise and high-rise buildings are not part of the HAZUS-MH MR2 building inventory in the central and eastern US (CEUS).

The 16 building types that comprise the eight state regions investigated in this study include:

•	W1	•	S3	•	C2L	•	RM1L
•	W2	•	S4L	•	C3L	•	RM2L
•	S1L	•	S5L	•	PC1	•	URML
•	S2L	•	C1L	•	PC2L	•	MH

Building fragilities are based on the spectral displacement shaking parameter. A typical set of fragility curves for buildings is displayed in Figure 2. Each of the four damage states utilized in HAZUS-MH MR2 is represented in the figure.



Figure 2: Example Set of Fragility Curves for Buildings

Fragility curves are developed using the equation below:

$$P[Exceedance_i \mid S_d] = \Phi\left[\frac{1}{\beta_{TOTi}} \ln\left(\frac{S_d}{LS_i}\right)\right] \quad (2)$$

Where:

In order to utilize the fragility relationships which provide the damage probabilities as a function of the structural response, the latter must first be determined using a capacity spectrum approach. This requires the definition of building capacity curves for the four seismic design levels; pre-, low-, moderate-, and high-code; of the 36 building types (36x4 curves).

				Height		
No.	Label	Description	Rang	e	Турі	cal
			Name	Stories	Stories	Feet
1	W1	Wood, Light Frame (≤ 5,000 sq. ft.)		1 - 2	1	14
2	W2	Wood, Commercial and Industrial (>		All	2	24
		5,000 sq. ft.)				
3	S1L	Steel Moment Frame	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
4	S1M		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
5	S1H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
6	S2L	Steel Braced Frame	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
7	S2M		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
8	S2H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
9	83	Steel Light Frame		All	1	15
10	S4L	Steel Frame with Cast-in-Place Concrete	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
11	S4M	Shear Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
12	S4H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
13	85L	Steel Frame with Unreinforced Masonry	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
14	85M	Infill Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
15	85H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
16	C1L	Concrete Moment Frame	Low-Rise	1-3	2	20
17	C1M		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
18	C1H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
19	C2L	Concrete Shear Walls	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
20	C2M		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
21	C2H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
22	C3L	Concrete Frame with Unreinforced	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
23	C3M	Masonry Infill Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
24	C3H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
25	PC1	Precast Concrete Tilt-Up Walls		All	1	15
26	PC2L	Precast Concrete Frames with Concrete	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
27	PC2M	Shear Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
28	PC2H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
29	RM1L	Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with	Low-Rise	1-3	2	20
30	RM1M	Wood or Metal Deck Diaphragms	Mid-Rise	4+	5	50
31	RM2L	Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
32	RM2M	Precast Concrete Diaphragms	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
33	RM2H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
34	URML	Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Walls	Low-Rise	1 - 2	1	15
35	URMM		Mid-Rise	3+	3	35
36	MH	Mobile Homes		All	1	10

Table 1: Model Building Types

Pushover curves are generally obtained from experimental results in published literature or through analytical models of specific structure types. Pushover curves are often represented as a roof displacement versus a total base shear. These units are not compatible with the units of HAZUS-MH MR2 building fragilities (in units of spectral displacement, S_d) and must be converted according to the following:

$$S_a = \frac{V/W}{\alpha_1} \qquad (3)$$

$$\alpha_{1} = \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_{i} \phi_{i1} / g\right]^{2}}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_{i} / g\right] \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{i} \phi_{i1}^{2}) / g\right]}$$
(4)
$$S_{d} = \frac{\Delta_{roof}}{PF_{1} \phi_{roof,1}}$$
(5)
$$PF_{1} = \left[\frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{i} \phi_{i1}) / g\right]}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{i} \phi_{i1}^{2}) / g\right]}$$
(6)

Equation (3) converts base shear into spectral acceleration while equation (5) converts roof displacement into spectral displacement. Parameters α_1 and PF₁ are provided in equations (4) and (6), respectively. In these equations, w_i denotes the weight of a single story, and φ_{il} denotes the value of the fundamental mode shape at story *i*. Please refer to the Applied Technology Council Report, ATC-40, from 1996 for further information on this procedure.

The HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for constructing capacity curves does not rely on analytical models, but rather uses the following parameters:

- C_s is the design strength coefficient (fraction of building's weight)
- T_e is the expected 'elastic' fundamental-mode period of the building (seconds)
- α_1 is the fraction of building weight effective against the pushover mode
- γ is the 'over-strength' factor relating 'true' yield strength to design strength
- λ is the 'over-strength' factor relating ultimate strength to yield strength
- μ is the 'ductility' ratio relating ultimate displacement to λ times the yield displacement

The first two parameters are determined using 1994 NEHRP Provisions, while the remaining parameters rely on the best estimates of typical design properties. These parameters can be found in Tables 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 of the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual, Chapter 5.

The control points, or yield and ultimate points, can be determined using the equations provided in Figure 3, and capacity curves can be constructed from these points. The relationship between spectral acceleration and displacement is constant until the yield point. After the ultimate point, spectral acceleration is constant, and this region is connected to the linear portion with a nonlinear relationship between spectral values.



Figure 3: Derivation of Capacity Curves

Threshold values for each of the damage states are determined using the capacity curves and the NEHRP Guidelines in FEMA 273 (1997). The following engineering criteria are established for different design levels and heights of the same construction type:

- Values of the drift ratio that define Complete damage to Moderate-Code buildings are assumed to be 75% of the drift ratio that define Complete damage to High-Code buildings, and values of the drift ratio that define Complete damage to Low-Code buildings are assumed to be 63% of the drift ratios that define Complete damage to High-Code buildings. Values of drift ratio that define Slight damage were assumed to be the same for High-Moderate-Low-Code buildings, given that this damage state typically does not exceed the building's elastic capacity. For each damage state, the drift ratio of a Pre-Code building is of the same building type.
- For all damage states, drift ratios for mid-rise buildings are assumed to be 67% of those for low-code buildings of the same type, and drift ratios for high-rise buildings are assumed to be 50% of those of low-rise buildings of the same type. Drift values can be converted to spectral displacement values using equation (5). An example showing the locations of damage state thresholds on the capacity curves is shown in Figure 4.



Figure 4: Capacity Curves and Damage State Thresholds for the Building Type W1

The total uncertainty, β_{TOT} , is required to draw the fragility curves for each building type. This parameter is required for each damage state and is given by the following equation:

$$\beta_{TOT} = \sqrt{\left(CONV\left[\beta_{C},\beta_{D}\right]^{2} + \left(\beta_{LS}\right)^{2}\right)}$$
(7)

Where β_C = the lognormal standard deviation parameter that describes the total variability of the capacity curve

- β_D = the lognormal standard deviation parameter that describes the variability of the demand spectrum
- β_{LS} = the lognormal standard deviation parameter that describes the uncertainty in the estimate of the median value of the threshold of the associated structural damage state

The β_C term is set to 0.25 for all code-level buildings and 0.3 for pre-code buildings. The β_{LS} term is set to 0.4 of all structural damage states and building types. The β_D term is set to 0.45 for short periods and 0.5 for long periods. The term $CONV[\beta_C, \beta_D]$ indicates the convolution of the uncertainty associated with the capacity and demand terms. This process is required to combine the uncertainty in capacity and demand as they are not independent of each other. This means that a change in capacity affects the demand imposed, and the demand imposed on the structure affects the capacity (for non-linear analysis).

The convolution process permits the determination of building performance when subjected to ground motion. This is accomplished with the capacity spectrum method (CSM), a non-linear static analysis procedure. The documentation of this procedure can be found in Freeman et al (1975), Freeman (1978), and later in ATC-40 (1996) and FEMA 274 (1997). HAZUS-MH MR2

uses an iterative process with capacity and demand curves to find the performance point. As an example, fragility curves for W1 (including the seismic design level) are shown in Figure 5.



Figure 5: Fragility Curves for W1 Buildings

Though not explained herein, the remaining inventory types utilize the default fragilities in HAZUS-MH MR2. All fragility parameters for the remaining inventory types can be found in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual. Updating fragilities will be a major component of all Regional level analyses, particularly focusing on wood frame building fragilities and bridge fragilities.

References

- Applied Technology Council (1996). ATC-40: Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Concrete Buildings, Volume 1. Redwood City, CA.
- Elnashai, A.S. & L.J. Cleveland (2007). "Importance and Challenges of Earthquake Impact Assessment in the Central and Eastern United States." Proceedings of the Asian Pacific Network of Centers for Earthquake Engineering Research (ANCER) Conference. Hong Kong, China. May 29-30.
- FEMA-NIBS, *HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual* (2006). Chapter 5. Washington, D.C. FEMA. 5-8.

- FEMA (1997). FEMA 273: NEHRP Guidelines for Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C.
- FEMA (1997). FEMA 274: NEHRP Commentary on the Guidelines for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C.
- Mid-America Earthquake Center (2007). "Comprehensive Seismic Loss Modeling for the State of Illinois" Report: Appendix III, Fragility Functions. June.
- Wen, Y.K, B.E. Ellingwood and J. Bracci (2003). "Vulnerability Function Derivation for Consequence-Based Engineering." Mid-America Earthquake Center Report.

Appendix IV: Earthquake Impact Assessment Methodology

The earthquake impact assessment completed by the Mid-America Earthquake Center and the George Washington University exclusively uses HAZUS-MH MR2 (future analyses will employ HAZUS and MAEviz, the MAE Center advanced impact assessment, management and decision-making software package). HAZUS-MH MR2 was developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS). Originally designed for mitigation purposes, the software is now used for response planning, emergency managers, building officials, local governments, insurance agencies, and research institutions. There are numerous methods of refining an analysis in HAZUS-MH MR2, and each user must determine the level of refinement and accuracy that is required for the analysis undertaken.

In general, an analysis requires three primary components: hazard, inventory, and fragility. Hazard definition consists not only of ground shaking but also ground deformation. Inventory includes all relevant infrastructure types, their locations, building types, and replacement costs. Finally, fragility relates the level of ground shaking to a likelihood of specific severity levels of damage. Each of these components is detailed in other appendices in this report. Please consult these appendices for more information on hazard, inventory, and fragility. This comprises the direct infrastructure damage in a region of interest. The direct damage calculations are then used to determine both direct and indirect induced damage, social impacts, and economic losses.

Level of Analysis in HAZUS-MH MR2

A Level I analysis is the most basic form of analysis in HAZUS-MH MR2. This type of analysis can be run without any improvements to the program itself or improvements to the inventory included with the program. Once a region of interest is chosen, the definition of hazard is chosen from the options provided in the program. A hazard may be deterministic or probabilistic. A deterministic hazard refers to a single event from which damage estimates are generated. A probabilistic hazard requires a return period and magnitude for the desired earthquake. Results are provided in terms of annualized losses instead of total losses from an event. The deterministic hazard is utilized exclusively in this report. There are several methods available in HAZUS-MH MR2 for a Level 1 hazard definition, including an arbitrary event in which magnitude and depth to the epicenter are specified and a historical event from the database is provided in the program. This level of analysis does not consider the effects of soil amplification and ground deformation. Neither inventory updates nor improvements to fragility relationships are required.

Various improvements are required to run a Level II analysis. Some improvement to the hazard is one critical facet of a Level II analysis. This includes such steps as improving the method of defining ground motion, the addition of soil amplification, the addition of liquefaction susceptibility to model ground deformation, and landslide susceptibility. Inventory improvements are also required and may include updates to critical facilities such as schools, hospitals, bridges, and utility facilities and networks, or the updating of demographic data. Updates to fragility functions are also classified as Level II improvements. It would be difficult to update all fragilities to all infrastructure types, due to the general lack of research in some areas. Buildings, bridges, and certain utility networks are common in the literature and may be the easiest to locate and update in HAZUS-MH MR2.

The most advanced analysis in HAZUS-MH MR2 is a Level II analysis. This type of analysis requires more time and effort to complete. Detailed engineering and economic loss studies may be completed. Site-specific investigations are also recommended at this stage of refinement. The use of the Advanced Engineering Building Module (AEBM) is available to import and assess damage for new types of buildings. Very few earthquake impact assessments reach this level of analysis, due to the time required. An example of an AEBM analysis was undertaken by Erberik and Elnashai (2006) for flat slab structures, a system that is not featured in the HAZUS building types.

HAZUS-MH MR2 Modules

The earthquake impact assessment in HAZUS-MH MR2 is carried out in numerous steps, or modules. Each type of damage, loss, or impact calculation generally has its own module. Many of the modules used in HAZUS-MH MR2 are detailed in the following discussion. It is possible for a user to select only certain modules in a specific analysis. For a comprehensive assessment, however, all modules are recommended. This includes all damage and losses for buildings, transportation and utility systems, as well as induced damage and social impacts.



Figure 1: HAZUS-MH MR2 Earthquake Impact Assessment Methodology

Potential Earth Science Hazard Module

The potential earth science hazard module includes the estimation of ground motion and ground failure, including liquefaction, landslides, and surface fault rupture. A minimum definition of hazard requires that the level of shaking be quantified over the entire region of interest, expressed as peak ground motion parameters (acceleration, velocity, and displacement). The hazard may also be expressed as peak response of simple structures (peak spectral values: peak spectral acceleration, velocity, and displacement). Attenuation relationships are the simplest method for determining ground motion and modeling a point-source event. Line-source modeling involves the rupture of an entire fault segment and may account for directionality of fault rupture in the estimation of ground motion. By including more aspects of ground motion, line-source modeling is preferred to a more simplified point-source model. Area source models also exist, and require considerable knowledge of the tectonic environment and mapping of fault geometry and likely mechanisms of rupture. For user-supplied ground motion, the internal ground motion calculation is not considered.

Ground failure parameters, such as liquefaction susceptibility, are culled from maps. Soil amplification is used to adjust the ground motion for local soil conditions. For example, soft soil deposits are likely to filter short period vibrations and amplify long period shaking, thus increasing the likelihood of damage to long period structures, such as high-rise buildings and long-span bridges. Liquefaction susceptibility refers to the change in phase of partially saturated soil deposits that may completely lose cohesion during prolonged shaking. This results in permanent ground deformations such as lateral spreading and settlement, both of which increase the likelihood of damage to infrastructure. Landslide susceptibility is included in earthquake impact assessments in order to define the likelihood of inclined deposits sliding during or shortly after earthquakes.

Inventory Module

The inventory utilized in HAZUS-MH MR2 includes the general building stock, essential facilities, transportation lifelines, utility lifelines, and high potential-loss facilities. The general building stock is not a collection of individual buildings but rather an estimated value of buildings in a given census tract. These estimates are based on population demographics, which factor into estimates of building counts and building uses. Building occupancy classes are used to categorize buildings by use. There are 33 occupancy classes in HAZUS-MH MR2 and 36 building types that categorize the structural system used in buildings. For more information on building types and occupancy classes, please refer to the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual, Chapter 5. In addition, square footage estimates are provided at the census tract level for the general building stock.

Critical facilities are included in the inventory module as individual data items. Critical facilities include essential facilities such as schools, emergency operation centers, hospitals, police stations and fire stations. Transportation lifelines include highway bridges and roads, railway bridges, facilities and tracks, airports, bus terminals, ports, and ferry facilities. Utility lifelines include waste water facilities and local distribution networks, potable water facilities and local distribution networks, as well as oil, electric power, and

communication facilities. For some levels of analysis, regional distribution networks may be added.

Direct Damage Module

The direct damage module uses the inventory and the potential earth science hazard to estimate damage for each inventory component. The damage results are given as a probability of reaching each of the four damage states: slight, moderate, extensive, and complete. The damage for each inventory item is described by a fragility (or vulnerability) function, which indicates the probability of damage based on an input ground motion hazard parameter. Both structural and nonstructural damage are approximated for the general building stock.

Induced Damage Module

The induced damage modules available in HAZUS-MH MR2 include debris generation, fire following earthquake, and inundation from dam failure. Dam failure and inundation are not included in this report due to the lack of inundation maps available. The fire following earthquake (FFE) estimates are not reported since the model for FFE is not regionally appropriate. The model was developed for an urban area, which is dissimilar to much of the NMSZ. Additionally, the module tends to produce fire ignitions in areas of high building density even if shaking and damage are non-existent and considered erroneous. The debris generation module is the only induced damage module utilized in this report and is determined based on building square footage in a census tract.

Direct Social Loss Module

This module includes estimates of casualties, displaced households, and temporary shelter requirements. Casualty estimates are generated for three times of day: 2:00 AM, 2:00 PM and 5:00 PM. These times of day are designed to represent various population locations, meaning when people are at home sleeping, at work, and commuting. Casualty estimates are divided into four severity levels as follows, along with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) classifications:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake

Casualties estimated are based on structural and nonstructural damage to buildings and do not consider induced damage caused by fire, car accidents, or other medical problems such as heart attacks related to stress. Casualties from secondary hazards are not considered and may include landslides, tsunamis, and dam failures. The HAZUS-MH MR2 casualty model classifies three different types of data:

- Scenario Time Definition
- Data Supplied by Other Modules
- Data Specific to the Casualty Module

The first item accounts for the distribution of the population at the three different times of day: 2:00 AM, 2:00 PM, and 5:00 PM. In general, casualties are expected to be greatest when an earthquake occurs during the night, when people are home in bed. This is not always the case, however, as is shown in some state analyses in this report.

The data supplied by other modules includes population distribution data, building stock inventory, and damage probabilities. The population distribution data is taken from the U.S. Census Bureau and from Dun and Bradstreet business data. The population is then divided into six categories, in which population percentages vary throughout the day:

- 1) Residential Population
- 2) Commercial Population
- 3) Educational Population
- 4) Industrial Population
- 5) Commuting Population
- 6) Hotel Population

Additionally, casualties are divided into categories for indoor and outdoor casualties. The basic framework for indoor casualties is shown in Figure 2. This model integrates various casualty severity levels with the occupancy types in HAZUS-MH MR2. A similar framework exists for outdoor casualties, though it is not shown here. Indoor and outdoor casualties are combined for a total estimate of casualties.



Figure 2: Indoor Casualty Event Tree

Displaced Households¹

The estimation of displaced households takes into consideration occupancy classes for residential buildings. While HAZUS-MH MR2 classifies residential buildings by the occupancy classes shown in Table 1, only RES1 and RES3 classes are considered in the calculation of displaced households.

RES1	Single Family Dwelling
RES2	Mobile Home
RES3A	Multi Family Dwelling – Duplex
RES3B	Multi Family Dwelling – 3-4 Units
RES3C	Multi Family Dwelling – 5-9 Units
RES3D	Multi Family Dwelling – 10-19 Units
RES3E	Multi Family Dwelling – 20-49 Units
RES3F	Multi Family Dwelling – 50+ Units
RES4	Temporary Lodging
RES5	Institutional Dormitory
RES6	Nursing Home

 Table 1: HAZUS-MH MR2 Residential Building Types

The HAZUS-MH MR2 technical manual provides the following formulas for the calculation of Displaced Households. Table 2 provides the definition of the variables used in the formulas.

$$\begin{split} SF_{\%} &= w_{SFM} SFM_{\%} + w_{SFE} SFE_{\%} + SFC_{\%} \\ MF_{\%} &= w_{MFM} MFM_{\%} + w_{MFE} MFE_{\%} + MFC_{\%} \\ DH_{\#} &= \left(SF_{\#}SF_{\%} + MF_{\#} MF_{\%}\right) \left(\frac{HH_{\#}}{SF_{\#} + MF_{\#}}\right) \end{split}$$

¹ Examination of the outputs for displaced population found that the calculations being performed within HAZUS-MH MR2 were incorrect due to errors in the software. This is currently being corrected in the next release of the software. To calculate these estimates for the scenarios discussed in this report, we combined the damage estimates and population estimates from HAZUS-MH MR2 and utilized the HAZUS-MH MR2 methodology to derive the number of displaced people.

$SFU_{\#}$	Total Number of Single-Family Dwelling Units
$MFU_{\#}$	Total Number of Multi-Family Dwelling Units
$HH_{\#}$	Total Number of Households
SFM _%	Damage state probability for moderate structural damage in the single-family
	residential occupancy class
SF _%	Damage state probability for extensive structural damage state in the single-family
	residential occupancy class
SFC _%	Damage state probability for complete structural damage state in the single-family
	residential occupancy class
MFM _%	Damage state probability for moderate structural damage state in the multi- family
	residential occupancy class
MFE _%	Damage state probability for extensive structural damage state in the multi- family
	residential occupancy class
$MFC_{\%}$	Damage state probability for complete structural damage state in the multi- family
	residential occupancy class

 Table 2: Definition of Variables Used in Displaced Household Calculations

HAZUS-MH MR2 calculates the damage probabilities based on structural building type and not occupancy class. HAZUS-MH MR2 then uses these structural damage probabilities, along with occupancy mapping (which structural building types are used for specific occupancy classes, including percentage), to calculate the number of damaged buildings per occupancy class. These in turn can be used to calculate the damage probabilities for the occupancy classes. For multifamily housing there is no data on average occupancy rates available. The classification of the RES3 classes provides ranges for the units in a dwelling; therefore the mappings in Table 3 were used in the calculations.

Туре	Description	Units
RES1	Single Family Dwelling	1
RES2	Mobile Home	1
RES3A	Multi Family Dwelling – Duplex	2
RES3B	Multi Family Dwelling – 3-4 Units	4
RES3C	Multi Family Dwelling – 5-9 Units	7
RES3D	Multi Family Dwelling – 10-19 Units	15
RES3E	Multi Family Dwelling – 20-49 Units	35
RES3F	Multi Family Dwelling – 50+ Units	75

Table 3: Mapping of Residential Building Type to Number of Units

The following damage weight factors provided by HAZUS-MH MR2 were also utilized.

- 100% of the households living in completely damaged RES1 and RES2 buildings are considered displaced
- 100% of the households living in completely damaged RES3 buildings are considered displaced
- 90% of the households living in extensively damaged RES3 buildings are considered displaced
- All other households will not seek shelter

Shelter Requirements²

The HAZUS-MH MR2 methodology is based on the following formula:

$$STP_{\#} = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \sum_{j=1}^{5} \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{l=1}^{3} \left(\alpha_{ijkl} \left(\frac{DH_{\#}POP}{HH_{\#}} \right) HI_{i}HE_{j}HO_{k}HA_{l} \right) \\ \alpha_{ijkl} = (IW * IM_{i}) + (EW * EM_{j}) + (OW * OM_{k}) + (AW * AM_{l})^{3}$$

² Examination of the outputs for shelter seeking population found that the calculations being performed within HAZUS-MH MR2 were incorrect due to errors in the software. This is currently being corrected in the next release of the software. To calculate these estimates for the scenarios discussed in this report, we combined the damage estimates and population estimates from HAZUS-MH MR2 and utilized the HAZUS-MH MR2 methodology to derive the number of shelter seeking people.

³ All weights relevant for the α_{ijkl} calculations are given in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual and are also listed in this appendix.

Table 4 provides a definition of the variables used in the above formula.

POP	Number of people in census tract
$HH_{\#}$	Number of Households
HI_1	Percentage of households whose income is under \$10,000
HI_2	Percentage of households whose income is \$10,001 to \$15,000
HI ₃	Percentage of households whose income is \$15,001 to \$25,000
HI ₄	Percentage of households whose income is \$25,001 to \$35,000
HI ₅	Percentage of households whose income is over \$35,000
HE_1	Percentage of white households
HE_2	Percentage of black households
HE_3	Percentage of Hispanic households
HE_4	Percentage of Native American households
HE_5	Percentage of Asian households
HO_1	Percentage of households owned by householder
HO_2	Percentage of households rented by householder
HA_1	Percentage of population under 16 years old
HA_2	Percentage of population between 16 and 65 years old
HA ₃	Percentage of population over 65 years old
HI	Percentage of population in the <i>i</i> th income class
HEj	Percentage of population in the j th ethnic class
HO _k	Percentage of population in the k^{th} ownership class
HA1	Percentage of population in the l^{th} age class
STP _%	Number of people requiring short term housing

Table 4: Definition of Variables Used in Shelter Seeking Population Calculations

The number of shelter seeking population is solely based on displaced persons due to structural damage. Severe damage to lifeline systems such as water and electricity might also add to the shelter population. In addition, the consecutive planning numbers do not consider severe damage to lifeline systems. All calculations are performed on census tract level using the Census 2000 data provided by HAZUS-MH MR2. Once calculated on the tract level, the results are aggregated on county level.

The calculation of the shelter seeking population takes into consideration – among other factors – ethnicity, income, and age. The corresponding factors from the shelter algorithm are then used along with census data to calculate the ethnic, income, and age distribution for the calculated number of shelter seeking people. This may drive different planning assumptions. For example, planners might want to plan differently if 90% of the shelter seeking population is of low income.

HAZUS-MH MR2 Parameters for Calculating Shelter Requirements and Displaced Households

Weight Factor	Description	Importance Factor
AW	Age Weighting Factor	0
EW	Ethnic Weighting Factor	0.27
IW	Income Weighting Factor	0.73
OW	Ownership Weighting Factor	0

Table 5: Demographic Weight Factors

Table 6: Demographic Modification Factors

Class	Description	Factor	
AM ₁	Population Under 16 Years Old	0.4	
AM ₂	Population Between 16 and 65 Years Old	0.4	
AM ₃	Population Over 65 Years Old	0.4	
EM_1	White	0.24	
EM ₂	Black	0.48	
EM ₃	Hispanic	0.47	
EM_4	Asian	0.26	
EM ₅	Native American	0.26	
IM ₁	Household Income < \$10000	0.62	
IM ₂	\$10000 < Household Income < \$15000	0.42	
IM ₃	\$15000 < Household Income < \$25000	0.29	
IM ₄	\$25000 < Household Income < \$35000	0.22	
IM ₅	\$35000 < Household Income	0.13	
OM ₁	Owner Occupied Dwelling	0.4	
OM ₂	Renter Occupied Dwelling	0.4	
Table 7: l	Damage	State	Factors
------------	--------	-------	---------
------------	--------	-------	---------

Class	Description	Value
W_{MFC}	Weight for Multi-Family Dwelling - Complete Damage	1
w_{MFE}	Weight for Multi-Family Dwelling - Extensive Damage	0.9
W_{MFM}	Weight for Multi-Family Dwelling - Moderate Damage	0
WSFC	Weight for Single Family Dwelling - Complete Damage	1
WSFE	Weight for Single Family Dwelling - Extensive Damage	0
WSFM	Weight for Single Family Dwelling - Moderate Damage	0

Needs Assessments for Shelter Planning

The estimated shelter seeking population is used to calculate the hazard generated demand for shelter planning. Again, these numbers consider only shelter seeking population due to structural damage. Needs assessments are provided for the following three planning periods: day 1, days 1-3, and days 1-7. The peak shelter population estimate is used to calculate the assessments for all three periods. The following sections explain the calculation parameters.

Table 8 provides the default requirements, values, and source of the value used in the calculations. Note: The default values can be changed for comparison purposes.

Shelter space total	Wator
 480 square foot per person (this includes space for all shelter related infrastructure) Source: The Sphere Project (2004) 	 Drinking water: 1 gallon per person per day Source: Sphere, Abou-Samra, USACE (2005)
 Sleeping space 60 square foot per person Source: The Sphere Project (2004), Abou-Samra Cots and Blankets 1 per person Source: The Sphere Project (2004), Abou-Samra Toilets 	 Water for washing and personal hygiene: 2 gallon per person per day Source: The Sphere Project (2004) Other water requirements (e.g. cooking, etc.): 2 gallon per person per day Source: The Sphere Project (2004) Calculation of truck loads 4750 gallons per truck load Source: USACE (2005)
Toilets 1 toilet per 40 persons Source: The Sphere Project (2004) Sinks 1 per 80 persons 	Food Estimated Calories • 2,000 Calories per person day • Source: National Research Council (1989) Fresh Food (if calories are provided by fresh food)
 Source: The Sphere Project (2004) Garbage Refuse Containers (30 gallon containers) 1 for every 50 persons Source: Abou-Samra, The Sphere Project (2004) Ice 8 pounds of ice per person (1 bag) Source: USACE (2005) Calculation of truck loads 5,000 bags / 40,000 pounds per truck Source: USACE (2005) 	 3 pounds per person per day Source: The Sphere Project (2004) MRE: 2 MRE per person per day Source: USACE (2005) Truck loads for MRE 21744 MRE per truck load Source: USACE (2005)

Table 8: Needs Assessments for Shelter Seeking Population

Shelter staffing requirements are highly dependent on the size of the shelters and other planning numbers. For these calculations, we assume an average shelter size of 200 people. The ARC uses detailed staffing algorithms to estimate personnel needs. Here, we simply use averaged numbers based on the ARC calculations for a 200 person shelter. The calculated number includes personnel on different levels (from management to manual labor).

- Staff to run shelters: 10 people
- Staff to feed people: 4 people
- Staff for bulk distribution: 8 people

An estimation of the number of displaced people with the seven most prevalent chronic illnesses is also calculated. By combining estimates of the displaced population and the prevalence of chronic conditions within a state (DeVol & Bedroussian, 2007), an estimation of the chronic cases of cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders, and pulmonary conditions was calculated. This estimate gives planners an approximation of the chronic cases that need to be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than one condition.

Direct Economic Loss Module

Direct economic losses are the economic impacts that result form direct damage to infrastructure. Each of the three main infrastructure categories has direct economic loss estimates: buildings, transportation lifelines, and utility lifelines. Building losses include structural and nonstructural losses, contents losses, and various other capital and business interruption losses. Transportation and utility lifelines include losses of infrastructure value only. No capital stock or business interruption losses are considered. There is a module for indirect economic losses that results from a lack of service and operational capabilities of businesses, in terms of employment and dollar value, though this is not included in this report.

References

Abou-Samra, Omar. Personal Conversation. Senior Associate, Mass Care, ARC.

Erberik, M.A. and Elnashai, A.S. (2006). Loss estimation analysis of flat-slab structures, American Society of Civil Engineers – Natural Hazards Review, 7 (1), 26-37.

- DeVol, R., & Bedroussian, A. (2007). An unhealthy America: the economic burden of chronic disease -- charting a new course to save lives and increase productivity and economic growth. Santa Monica, CA: Milken Institute.
- National Research Council (1989). Subcommittee on the Tenth Edition of the Recommended Dietary Allowances, Food and Nutrition Board, Commission on Life Sciences, National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, DC.
- Sphere Project, The (2004): Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards for Disaster Response, The Sphere Project, Geneva, Switzerland.
- USACE: Logistics Technical Bulletin (2005): Vol. 1 (1), State of Florida, Unified Logistics Section, State Emergency Response Team, Tallahassee, FL.

Appendix V: Detailed Earthquake Impact Assessment Results

The results presented in this appendix are a more comprehensive account of the information contained in the main body of this report. Each state is discussed individually and results are not summed over all states because different scenarios are employed for each. Only damage and functionality losses experienced by infrastructure are explained herein. All social and economic losses caused by damage to infrastructure are dealt with in appendix VI. Damage and loss of functionality are shown for both critical counties and statewide totals. Building damage is detailed by occupancy class. Essential facilities damage and functionality loss are shown for all facility types. Transportation lifeline impacts are illustrated for bridges primarily, though other critical transportation infrastructure types are included. Utility lifelines damage is illustrated with facility and network damage figures. Maps of damage and functionality of various infrastructure components are not illustrate damage and functionality levels of various infrastructure items in each state. Additionally, damage and functionality results for both scenarios in Alabama and Indiana are presented herein.

Alabama – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 67 counties in the State of Alabama. Alabama is approximately 51,700 square miles and is bordered by Tennessee to the north, Florida and the Gulf of Mexico to the south, Georgia to the east and Mississippi to the west. For the purposes of this analysis, 12 critical counties have been identified in the northwestern portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These critical counties are listed and are a primary focus in this impact assessment:

Colbert
Cullman
Fayette
Franklin
Lamar
Lamar
Marion
Morgan
Walker
Winston

The New Madrid Seismic Zone scenario for the State of Alabama is comprised of a magnitude 7.7 (M_w 7.7) event along the southwest segment on the middle fault in the New Madrid fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for the middle fault in the proposed New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ). Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northeast, central and southwest. The worst-case scenario for the state of Alabama, the critical counties in particular, is an event on the eastern fault line in the southwest segment. The location of this scenario event is illustrated in Figure 1. For more information on the hazard employed in this scenario please reference Appendix I.



Figure 1: Presumed Seismic Zone Boundaries

Buildings in Alabama are classified in two separate ways for damage estimates; by building use, termed "occupancy," and structure type/material, termed "building type." Damage to Alabama buildings is illustrated in Table 1 and Table 2 for the state and the critical counties, respectively, by occupancy. Residential structures are the most prevalent occupancy type in the State of Alabama and also incur the most cases of damage. Nearly 98% of all moderate and severe damage occurs in single family home and 'other residential' occupancy categories. There are no cases of complete damage which is defined by damage to critical structural connections and significant lateral displacements of structural systems. Cases of partial or complete collapse are rare, though in most cases result in uninhabitable structures. Shaking from a New Madrid event is not as intense as in other states closer to the fault and damage in Alabama, and even the critical counties, is not as catastrophic as a result. For definitions of each damage level please refer Appendix VII.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)						
General Occupancy Type	Complete Damage					
Single Family	1,303,224	539	0			
Other Residential	354,031	5,581	0			
Commercial	18,249	119	0			
Industrial	2,048	20	0			
Other	2,014	9	0			
Total	1,679,566	6,268	0			

Table 1: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Alabama

 Table 2: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 12 Critical Counties

General Occupancy Type Damage (12 Critical Counties)					
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage		
Single Family	183,790	358	0		
Other Residential	57,508	2,490	0		
Commercial	1,630	57	0		
Industrial	293	13	0		
Other	198	5	0		
Total	243,419	2,923	0		

Building damage is also described by building type, and in Alabama the most common building type is wood construction. Typically wood construction shows damage in proportion to the quantity of wood buildings, though due to the low level of shaking and relative flexibility of wood frame structures a very small proportion of Alabama wood frame buildings incur moderate or severe damage. Roughly 120 of the nearly 6,300 moderate and severe damage cases are wood frame. Mobile homes, which represent a much smaller portion of Alabama buildings, less than 20%, represent over 85% of the moderate and severe damage cases. This equates to 5,465 moderately or severely damaged mobile homes. Unreinforced masonry (URM) structures are also vulnerable to the moderate levels of shaking Alabama's critical counties, in particular. Though URMs comprise only 5% of all Alabama buildings they account for roughly 550 moderately or severely damaged structures. Concrete, steel and reinforced masonry construction types represent considerably fewer cases of damage. Many cases of damage occur in the 12 critical counties, though other northern Alabama counties also experience instances of moderate damage.

Building Damage by Building Type									
Building Type	Building Type None Slight Moderate Extensive Complete								
Wood	1,258,071	6,679	120	0	0				
Steel	11,399	439	97	3	0				
Concrete	3,156	100	23	0	0				
Precast	857	28	10	1	0				
Reinforced Masonry	5,178	70	24	1	0				
Unreinforced Masonry	74,050	3,436	506	18	0				
Mobile Home	278,809	31,026	5,417	48	0				
Total	1,631,520	41,778	6,197	71	0				

Table 3: Building Damage by Building Type for State of Alabama

Even the most intense shaking in northwestern Alabama counties is not severe enough to generate many cases of damage to essential facilities. This damage state is identified by significant cracking to unreinforced masonry walls as well as some connection damage to column/beam joints in unreinforced masonry building. Liquefaction susceptibility data was not available when this scenario was completed and thus damage estimates may be slightly lower than if this liquefaction data were incorporated. Critical facilities remain largely unaffected by the New Madrid event with no cases of moderate or more severe damage and very limited loss of functionality the day after the earthquake, as shown in Table 4. These facilities will be equipped to treat injured persons and provide emergency services in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake.

Most transportation facilities remain undamaged for this NMSZ event. Highway bridges and roadways show no moderate or severe damage and no considerable loss of functionality immediately after the event. The same is true for railway facilities and rail lines as well as airports and their respective runways. Port facilities show that 38 facilities will not be operational immediately after the earthquake and are likely to remain as such for at least a week.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality							
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities (State)	Total No. Facilities (12 Critical Counties)	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
Hospitals	137	19	0	0	137		
Schools	1,870	270	0	0	1,870		
EOCs	27	3	0	0	27		
Police Stations	496	78	0	0	496		
Fire Stations	1,388	250	0	0	1,388		

Table 4: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality¹

Table 5: Damage to Highway Bridges

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of BridgesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctionality >50% at Day 1(Damage > 50%)(Damage > 50%)(Damage > 50%)						
12 Critical Counties	2,366	0	0	2,366			
Remaining Counties	12,231	0	0	12,231			
Total State	14,597	0	0	14,597			

 Table 6: Damage to Airports

Airport Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of AirportsAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctionality >50% at Day 1(Damage > 50%)(Damage > 50%)50% at Day 1						
12 Critical Counties	55	0	0	55			
Remaining Counties	414	0	0	414			
Total State	469	0	0	469			

¹ For Tables 4-13 in this appendix the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Transportation System Damage					
Transportatio n System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage> 50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%
Highway	Segments	4,897	0	0	4,897
	Bridges	14,597	0	0	14,597
	Tunnels	0	0	0	0
Railways	Segments	2,678	0	0	2,678
	Bridges	118	0	0	118
	Tunnels	9	0	0	9
	Facilities	109	0	0	109
Bus	Facilities	24	0	0	24
Light Rail	Segments	0	0	0	0
	Bridges	0	0	0	0
	Facilities	0	0	0	0
Ferry	Facilities	6	6	6	0
Port	Facilities	321	0	0	274
Airport	Facilities	469	0	0	469
	Runways	292	0	0	292

 Table 7: Transportation System Damage for the State of Alabama

As with transportation lifelines, utility lifelines remain largely unaffected by a NMSZ event. All utility facilities are operational the day after the earthquake and do not show any form of significant damage. While there is no appreciable damage to utility facilities, utility networks do experience some damage. Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not part of the default inventory, or local inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional oil pipelines are added from HSIP 2007 to provide damage estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are comprised of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at roughly 180 and 722, respectively, as shown in Table 14. Local natural gas lines, however, show the greatest break and leak rates per length of pipe at roughly 0.01 leaks/mile (1 leak every 100 miles) and 0.003 breaks/mile (roughly 1 break every 333 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of 613 leaks and 153 breaks over the combined length of 59,263 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
Total No. of Potable Water FacilitiesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctionality >50%)Total No. of DamageAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctionality >50% at Day 1							
12 Critical Counties	7	0	0	7			
Remaining Counties	23	0	0	23			
Total State	30	0	0	30			

Table 8: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Table 9: Damage to Waste Water Facilities

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Waste Water FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functionality >50% at Day 1						
12 Critical Counties	63	0	0	63			
Remaining Counties	347	0	0	347			
Total State	410	0	0	410			

Table 10: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Natural Gas Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
12 Critical Counties	60	0	0	60		
Remaining Counties	308	0	0	308		
Total State	368	0	0	368		

Table 11: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Oil Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
12 Critical Counties	5	0	0	5		
Remaining Counties	107	0	0	107		
Total State	112	0	0	112		

Table 12: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Electric Power Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
12 Critical Counties	98	0	0	98		
Remaining Counties	1,327	0	0	1,327		
Total State	1,425	0	0	1,425		

Table 13: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
12 Critical Counties	2,207	0	0	2,207		
Remaining Counties	13,134	0	0	13,134		
Total State	15,341	0	0	15,341		

Potable water service is expected to be retained for all residences the day after the scenario earthquake. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. Additional information on this formula is available in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual that accompanies the program. Though the number of leaks and breaks may appear to be a large number, they are spread across many miles of pipeline, resulting in no interruptions in service as shown in Table 15. These damage estimates are very low compared to damage sustained by the same types of pipe in other states exposed to the NMSZ event. Without liquefaction information incorporated for the majority of the state it is difficult to calculate damage to underground pipelines. The permanent ground deformation calculated from liquefaction susceptibility is a critical factor in determining breaks and leaks to pipelines. For improved estimates of utility service outages, more liquefaction susceptibility information must be used.

Pipeline Damage						
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks			
Potable Water - Local	200,893	722	180			
Waste Water - Local	120,536	571	143			
Natural Gas - Regional	8,558	3	1			
Natural Gas - Local	50,705	610	152			
Oil - Regional	2,913	1	0			

Table 14: Pipeline Damage

Table 15: Utility Service Interruptions

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service						
	No. Households	Day 1	Day 3	Day 7	Day 30	Day 90
Potable Water	1 727 090	0	0	0	0	0
Electric Power	1,737,000	0	0	0	0	0

A NOTE ON THE DETERMINATION OF DAMAGE TO INFRASTRUCTURE:

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

The following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county.

The damage estimates shown previously for the same infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (1) and employed in damage estimates for

the preceding tables. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Colbert County, Alabama 10 waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 1:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 0 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of **1** at least moderately damaged waste water facility

In the case of Colbert County, Alabama, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a higher estimate of damage as opposed to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (1). Though not illustrated here, it is possible to have a case where the point-by-point damage estimation procedure in footnote (1) predicts greater damage than the estimation procedure employed in the topic damage tables in this appendix. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities for the 12 critical counties in Alabama shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 3 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 0 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces greater damage. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this section of the appendix for the NMSZ scenario in Alabama.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Alabama. These tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage levels for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Colbert						
Single Family	16,434	1,135	77	3	0	17,649
Other Residential	2,873	460	140	3	0	3,476
Commercial	129	30	12	1	0	172
Industrial	41	6	3	0	0	50
Other	17	4	2	0	0	23
Cullman						
Single Family	22,631	79	3	0	0	22,713
Other Residential	7,743	743	91	0	0	8,577
Commercial	214	6	1	0	0	221
Industrial	15	0	0	0	0	15
Other	24	1	0	0	0	25
Fayette						
Single Family	4,794	448	31	1	0	5,274
Other Residential	1,121	514	262	6	0	1,903
Commercial	18	7	3	0	0	28
Industrial	12	5	2	0	0	19
Other	2	1	0	0	0	3
Franklin						
Single Family	8,161	303	20	1	0	8,485
Other Residential	1,974	484	207	5	0	2,670
Commercial	50	6	2	0	0	58
Industrial	15	1	0	0	0	16
Other	3	0	0	0	0	3
Lamar						
Single Family	3,916	444	30	1	0	4,391
Other Residential	878	665	365	9	0	1,917
Commercial	12	5	2	0	0	19
Industrial	8	3	2	0	0	13
Other	3	1	0	0	0	4
Lauderdale						
Single Family	26,861	1,814	123	4	0	28,802
Other Residential	3,799	1,009	427	10	0	5,245
Commercial	206	60	24	2	0	292
Industrial	22	6	3	0	0	31
Other	26	4	1	0	0	31
Lawrence						
Single Family	9,354	33	1	0	0	9,388
Other Residential	3,938	387	48	0	0	4,373
Commercial	32	1	0	0	0	33
Industrial	4	0	0	0	0	4
Other	6	0	0	0	0	6

Table 16: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Limestone						
Single Family	19,418	68	3	0	0	19,489
Other Residential	4,219	391	48	0	0	4,658
Commercial	103	3	0	0	0	106
Industrial	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	23	1	0	0	0	24
Marion						
Single Family	7,618	411	28	1	0	8,058
Other Residential	2,735	795	357	8	0	3,895
Commercial	40	8	3	0	0	51
Industrial	13	3	1	0	0	17
Other	7	1	1	0	0	9
Morgan						
Single Family	33,621	117	5	0	0	33,743
Other Residential	6,412	552	67	0	0	7,031
Commercial	356	10	1	0	0	367
Industrial	75	2	0	0	0	77
Other	41	1	0	0	0	42
Walker						
Single Family	18,950	66	3	0	0	19,019
Other Residential	8,565	832	102	0	0	9,499
Commercial	226	6	1	0	0	233
Industrial	8	0	0	0	0	8
Other	20	0	0	0	0	20
Winston						
Single Family	6,430	325	22	1	0	6,778
Other Residential	3,146	782	327	7	0	4,262
Commercial	38	9	4	0	0	51
Industrial	34	4	1	0	0	39
Other	6	0	0	0	0	6

	Te4e1 #	Day	v 1	Day	7 3	Da	y 7	Day	v 30	Day	90
Counties	of Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%
Colbert	313	212	67.70	213	68.20	282	90.10	312	99.70	312	99.80
Cullman	215	196	91.10	196	91.30	212	98.40	215	99.90	215	99.90
Fayette	183	124	67.70	125	68.20	165	90.10	182	99.70	183	99.80
Franklin	133	106	79.40	106	79.75	125	94.25	133	99.80	133	99.85
Lamar	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lauderdale	372	251.84	67.7	253.7	68.2	335.17	90.1	370.88	99.7	371.26	99.8
Lawrence	98	89.278	91.1	89.474	91.3	96.432	98.4	97.902	99.9	97.902	99.9
Limestone	101	92.011	91.1	92.213	91.3	99.384	98.4	100.9	99.9	100.9	99.9
Marion	128	102	79.40	102	79.75	121	94.25	128	99.80	128	99.85
Morgan	715	651	91.10	653	91.30	704	98.40	714	99.90	714	99.90
Walker	267	243	91.10	244	91.30	263	98.40	267	99.90	267	99.90
Winston	99	67	67.70	68	68.20	89	90.10	99	99.70	99	99.80

Table 17: Hospital Functionality

* Note: Discrepancies between the number of hospital beds and the percentage of beds may occur due to rounding.

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Colbert	9	61.28
Cullman	5	94.10
Fayette	3	65.97
Franklin	5	77.22
Lamar	5	51.90
Lauderdale	9	75.34
Lawrence	6	94.10
Limestone	5	94.10
Marion	8	73.00
Morgan	9	94.10
Walker	9	94.10
Winston	5	85.66

Table 18: Police Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Colbert	26	70.47
Cullman	37	94.10
Fayette	7	65.97
Franklin	13	80.03
Lamar	7	51.90
Lauderdale	28	64.88
Lawrence	16	94.10
Limestone	26	94.10
Marion	18	76.72
Morgan	46	94.10
Walker	33	94.10
Winston	13	77.87

Table 19: School Functionality

Table 20: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Colbert	20	75.11
Cullman	53	94.10
Fayette	13	61.64
Franklin	14	73.00
Lamar	10	51.90
Lauderdale	23	70.25
Lawrence	11	94.10
Limestone	20	94.10
Marion	12	73.00
Morgan	34	94.10
Walker	26	94.10
Winston	14	79.03

Table 21: Communication Functionality

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Colbert	315	94.44	99.10	99.50	99.90	99.90
Cullman	272	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Fayette	52	98.89	99.80	99.85	99.90	99.90
Franklin	107	97.67	99.61	99.76	99.90	99.90
Lamar	50	94.33	99.08	99.49	99.90	99.90
Lauderdale	217	95.23	99.22	99.56	99.90	99.90
Lawrence	107	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Limestone	184	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Marion	131	95.27	99.23	99.56	99.90	99.90
Morgan	442	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Walker	245	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Winston	85	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Colbert	22,461	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cullman	30,706	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fayette	7,493	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Franklin	12,259	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lamar	6,468	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lauderdale	36,088	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lawrence	13,538	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Limestone	24,688	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marion	12,697	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Morgan	43,602	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Walker	28,364	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Winston	10,107	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 22: Households without Potable Water Service

Table 23: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Colbert	2	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Cullman	1	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Fayette	2	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Franklin	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lamar	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lauderdale	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lawrence	1	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Limestone	1	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Marion	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Morgan	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Walker	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Winston	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Colbert	1,510	8	2
Cullman	2,412	13	3
Fayette	1,359	7	2
Franklin	1,491	16	4
Lamar	1,412	22	5
Lauderdale	2,088	11	3
Lawrence	1,454	8	2
Limestone	1,591	9	2
Marion	1,857	28	7
Morgan	1,752	10	2
Walker	2,235	12	3
Winston	1,468	8	2

 Table 24: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Table 25: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Colbert	22,461	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cullman	30,706	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fayette	7,493	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Franklin	12,259	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lamar	6,468	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lauderdale	36,088	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lawrence	13,538	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Limestone	24,688	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marion	12,697	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Morgan	43,602	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Walker	28,364	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Winston	10,107	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Colbert	10	54.0%	34.8%	10.3%	0.9%	0.1%
Cullman	9	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Fayette	2	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Franklin	5	65.9%	26.3%	7.1%	0.6%	0.0%
Lamar	5	65.9%	26.3%	7.1%	0.6%	0.0%
Lauderdale	2	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Lawrence	4	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Limestone	5	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Marion	5	65.9%	26.3%	7.1%	0.6%	0.0%
Morgan	8	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Walker	7	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Winston	1	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 26: Waste Water Facility Damage

 Table 27: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Colbert	906	7	2
Cullman	1,447	10	3
Fayette	816	6	1
Franklin	895	13	3
Lamar	847	17	4
Lauderdale	1,253	9	2
Lawrence	872	6	2
Limestone	955	7	2
Marion	1,114	22	5
Morgan	1,051	8	2
Walker	1,341	10	2
Winston	881	6	2

Counties	# of Bridges	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Colbert	131	97.19%	1.93%	0.54%	0.28%	0.04%
Cullman	230	98.28%	1.15%	0.35%	0.18%	0.02%
Fayette	162	97.66%	1.72%	0.38%	0.19%	0.02%
Franklin	182	97.18%	2.00%	0.51%	0.26%	0.03%
Lamar	172	98.68%	0.99%	0.19%	0.11%	0.01%
Lauderdale	227	96.76%	2.28%	0.60%	0.30%	0.04%
Lawrence	211	98.33%	1.08%	0.36%	0.19%	0.03%
Limestone	299	97.10%	1.96%	0.59%	0.30%	0.04%
Marion	232	98.12%	1.32%	0.34%	0.18%	0.02%
Morgan	239	97.81%	1.37%	0.50%	0.27%	0.04%
Walker	196	96.28%	2.50%	0.77%	0.38%	0.05%
Winston	85	97.74%	1.62%	0.40%	0.20%	0.03%

Table 28: Highway Bridge Damage

Table 29: Highway Bridge Functionality

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Colbert	131	98.75	99.39	99.61	99.64	99.78
Cullman	230	99.20	99.58	99.72	99.74	99.82
Fayette	162	99.02	99.55	99.70	99.72	99.81
Franklin	182	98.78	99.42	99.63	99.66	99.78
Lamar	172	99.43	99.72	99.80	99.81	99.86
Lauderdale	227	98.60	99.34	99.58	99.62	99.76
Lawrence	211	99.19	99.56	99.70	99.73	99.82
Limestone	299	98.69	99.35	99.59	99.63	99.76
Marion	232	99.17	99.58	99.72	99.74	99.82
Morgan	239	98.94	99.42	99.62	99.65	99.78
Walker	196	98.33	99.19	99.49	99.54	99.72
Winston	85	99.02	99.53	99.69	99.72	99.81

Alabama – East Tennessee Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 67 counties in the State of Alabama. For the purposes of this analysis, 13 critical counties have been identified in the northeastern portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 13 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document, though it is possible for damage to occur outside these 13 counties. The critical counties are listed below:

- Blount • Jackson
- Calhoun
- Cherokee

• Jefferson

• Limestone

- Dekalb
- Madison • Etowah
 - Marshall

- Morgan
- Saint Clair
- Talladega

Please note, the critical counties chosen for the East Tennessee Seismic Zone (ETSZ) scenario are different then those used in the New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ) scenario. Counties closest to the seismic source are considered critical, thus the ETSZ critical counties are located in the northeastern portion of Alabama, while NMSZ critical counties are located in the northwestern portion of Alabama. For names and locations of critical counties in each scenario event please reference the main section of this report and the damage and functionality maps in another appendix.

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Alabama employs one scenario event in Dekalb County. The scenario consists of a M_w5.9 earthquake in the East Tennessee Seismic Zone (ETSZ). The epicenter location as well as all soil and liquefaction data were provided by the Geologic Survey of Alabama (GSA) and shown in Figure 2. A set of five attenuation functions was used to generate ground motion. The attenuations and weighting factors are listed below:

Atkinson and Boore (1997)	0.250
Toro, Abrahamson and Schneider (1997)	0.250
Frankel, Mueller, Barnhard, Perkins et al. (1996)	0.250
Campbell (2002)	0.125
Sommerville, Collins, Abrahamson et al. (2002)	0.125

It is relevant to note that the attenuation from Frankel, Mueller, Barnhard, Perkins et al. (1996) can not be computed for a magnitude of 5.9. The attenuation only applies to earthquakes with magnitudes of 6.0 or greater. In order to determine regional ground shaking with this attenuation a magnitude of 6.0 was used. The four remaining attenuations employed a magnitude 5.9, as prescribed by GSA. This change does not impact the intensity of regional shaking significantly and is acceptable for the purposes of this assessment.



Figure 2: Location of M_w5.9 Earthquake

The East Tennessee Seismic Zone scenario generates nearly 550 cases of complete damage, unlike the New Madrid Seismic Zone scenario. All of these cases of complete damage occur nearest the epicenter in DeKalb, Etowah and Jackson Counties. Table 30 and Table 31 report at least moderate damage which includes moderate to severe damage and complete damage. All of the damage estimates for the at least moderate damage case include complete damage. Since there are no cases of complete damage in the NMSZ scenario for Alabama the moderate to severe damage level can be considered at least moderate and compared to the building damage shown here for the ETSZ scenario.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	1,303,224	2,431	410			
Other Residential	354,031	3,241	127			
Commercial	18,249	61	5			
Industrial	2,048	48	2			
Other	2,014	5	0			
Total	1,679,566	5,786	544			

Table 30: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Alabama

The ETSZ scenario generates nearly 5,800 cases of at least moderate damage across the entire state. This is approximately 500 fewer cases than the NMSZ scenario. Nearly all damaged structures are located in the 13 critical counties, though less than half of the structural damage in the NMSZ scenario is confined to the critical counties. As with the previous scenario for Alabama, nearly all damage, roughly 98%, is incurred by

residential structures. The remaining 2% is attributed to commercial, industrial and other buildings which include government, educational, religious and agricultural buildings.

Wood construction accounts for 45% of all building damage in this earthquake scenario. Additionally, mobile homes (MH) consist of 47 % of the damages cases, while unreinforced masonry (URM) account for 8% of all building damage. Concrete, steel and reinforced masonry construction types represent considerably fewer cases of damage.

General Occupancy Type Damage (13 Critical Counties)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	535,829	2,427	410			
Other Residential	106,769	3,216	127			
Commercial	10,454	60	5			
Industrial	815	48	2			
Other	777	5	0			
Total	654,644	5,756	544			

 Table 31: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 13 Critical Counties

Building Damage by Building Type							
Building Type None Slight Moderate Extensive Complete							
Wood	1,255,446	7,365	1,596	69	394		
Steel	11,814	64	42	14	4		
Concrete	3,247	16	11	4	2		
Precast	879	8	5	2	0		
Reinforced Masonry	5,234	19	14	5	3		
Unreinforced Masonry	76,394	1,127	371	81	38		
Mobile Home	305,185	6,983	2,675	352	105		
Total	1,658,199	15,582	4,714	527	546		

Table 32: Building Damage by Building Type for State of Alabama

Numerous essential facilities experience moderate or significant damage from the scenario earthquake. There are 12 fire stations in northeastern Alabama that incur at least moderate damage and 22 facilities are not operational the day after the event. Several police stations and schools are damaged and not functional immediately after the event which is likely to inhibit the emergency response in these heavily damaged areas of northeastern Alabama. Table 33 illustrates essential facilities damage throughout the state, while Table 34 shows damage for the 13 critical counties only.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
Hospitals	137	1	0	136		
Schools	1,870	8	0	1,856		
EOCs	27	0	0	27		
Police Stations	496	6	0	485		
Fire Stations	1,388	12	0	1,366		

Table 33: Essential Facilities Damage	& Functionality for the State of Alabama ²
- asie eet Essenitian - actinities - annage	to i another and state of the state

Table 34: Essential Facilities Damage	e & Functionality	for 13 Critical	Counties
---------------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (13 Critical Counties)						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
Hospitals	48	1	0	47		
Schools	698	8	0	690		
EOCs	8	0	0	7		
Police Stations	161	6	0	150		
Fire Stations	419	12	0	397		

Damage to transportation facilities and networks is very limited even though the ETSZ scenario produces more intense shaking in portions of northeastern Alabama. Only one highway bridge incurs moderate damage and only one bridge is not operational the day after the earthquake. All airports are undamaged and remain operational immediately after the earthquake, as do all railway and bus facilities. Numerous ports show reduced functionality the day after the earthquake as 47 ports are not operational. The same inventory used in the Alabama NMSZ scenario was employed in this scenario and thus the same updates from HSIP 2007 apply.

Table 35: Damage	to Highway]	Bridges
------------------	--------------	---------

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of BridgesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage (Damage >50%)Functionality > 50% at Day 1					
13 Critical Counties	4,014	1	0	4,013		
Remaining Counties	10,583	0	0	10,583		
Total State	14,597	1	0	14,596		

 $^{^2}$ For Tables 33-43 in this appendix the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Table 36: Damage to Airports

Airport Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of AirportsAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage Damage (Damage >50%)Functionality 50% at Day 1					
13 Critical Counties	115	0	0	115		
Remaining Counties	354	0	0	354		
Total State	469	0	0	469		

Transportation System Damage						
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%	
Highway	Segments Bridges Tunnels	4,897 14,597 0	0 1 0	0 0 0	4,897 14,596 0	
Railways	Segments Bridges Tunnels Facilities	2,678 118 9 109	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2,678 118 9 109	
Bus	Facilities	24	0	0	24	
Light Rail	Segments Bridges Facilities	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	
Ferry	Facilities	6	6	6	0	
Port	Facilities	321	0	0	274	
Airport	Facilities Runways	469 292	0 0	0 0	469 292	

 Table 37: Transportation System Damage for State of Alabama

Utility lifelines show more substantial damage to networks than their facility counterparts. Very few facilities are moderately damaged. Potable water, waste water and electric power facilities incur a total of four moderately damaged facilities nearest the epicenter. Communication facilities incur numerous cases of damage in northeastern Alabama. Over 162 facilities are moderately damaged though this only equates to 3% of all facilities in the critical counties and roughly 1% of all communication facilities in the State of Alabama. The functionality of utility facilities in Alabama is largely unchanged by the earthquake in the ETSZ. Several facilities nearest the epicenter are not operational the day after the earthquake, though the majority of the state retains its services.

Table 38: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Potable Water FacilitiesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctional 50% at Da					
13 Critical Counties	14	1	0	13		
Remaining Counties	16	0	0	16		
Total State	30	1	0	29		

Table 39: Damage to Waste Water Facilities

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Potable Water Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)	Functionality > 50% at Day 1		
13 Critical Counties	130	2	0	125		
Remaining Counties	280	0	0	280		
Total State	410	2	0	405		

Table 40: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Natural GasAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functionality >50% at Day					
13 Critical Counties	100	0	0	100		
Remaining Counties	268	0	0	268		
Total State	368	0	0	368		

Table 41: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderat Damage (Damage > 50%)		Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1				
13 Critical Counties	38	0	0	38				
Remaining Counties	74	0	0	74				
Total State	112	0	0	112				

Table 42: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Electric Power Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality > 50% at Day 1				
13 Critical Counties	395	1	0	394				
Remaining Counties	1,030	0	0	1,030				
Total State	1,425	1	0	1,424				

Communication Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality > 50% at Day 1				
13 Critical Counties	5,180	162	0	5,149				
Remaining Counties	10,161	0	0	10,161				
Total State	15,341	162	0	15,310				

 Table 43: Damage to Communication Facilities

Pipelines incur several hundred leaks and breaks throughout the state. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at roughly 71 and 188, respectively. In addition, waste water lines show an estimated 149 leaks and 56 breaks, over nearly 75,000 miles of pipe. Regional natural gas and oil pipelines show no breaks and leaks. The lack of damage to regional pipelines is likely due to the low levels of shaking throughout the majority of the state. In addition, regions with more intense shaking near the epicenter are also comprised of very stable soils that are unlikely to liquefy. Without substantial ground deformation pipelines are unlikely to break. With very little damage to potable water lines the number of households without water, even immediately after the event, is very low. Electric power, however, is out for nearly 7,400 households in northeastern Alabama. Numerous households have service restored within a week, though roughly 1,700 households are still without power. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. Additional information on this formula is available in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual that accompanies the program.

Pipeline Damage								
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks					
Potable Water - Local	124,755	188	71					
Waste Water - Local	74,853	149	56					
Natural Gas - Regional	5,306	0	0					
Natural Gas - Local	4,990	159	60					
Oil - Regional	1,809	0	0					

Table 44: Pipeline Damage

Table 4	5:	Utilitv	Service	Interruptions
I uble		Cunty		inter i aptions

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service							
	No. Households	Day 1	Day 3	Day 7	Day 30	Day 90	
Electric Power	1 727 090	7,389	4,367	1,715	349	10	
Potable Water	1,737,080	0	0	0	0	0	

A NOTE ON THE DETERMINATION OF DAMAGE TO INFRASTRUCTURE:

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify

damage based on the likelihood of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

The following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county.

The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (2) and employed in the preceding damage tables for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Dekalb County, Alabama 7 waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 2:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 1 at least moderately damaged waste water facility
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of 2 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

In the case of Dekalb County, Alabama, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a higher estimate of damage as opposed to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (2). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Alabama are estimated to incur greater damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities for the 13 critical counties in Alabama shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 5 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 2 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces greater damage. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix for the ETSZ scenario in Alabama.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the ETSZ scenario critical counties in Alabama. These tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage levels for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Blount						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial	13,876 5,988 4,401	25 126 41	1 7 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	13,902 6,121 4,445
Other	10 21	0	0	0	0	21
Calhoun	51	0	0	0	0	51
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	33,821 9,256 345 71 37	112 352 4 1 0	4 26 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	33,937 9,634 349 72 37
Cherokee						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	5,611 2,422 32 2 10	1,417 1,311 5 0 2	242 912 2 0 1	10 69 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	7,280 4,714 39 2 13
Dekalb						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	10,799 3,405 58 20 10	4,909 2,074 40 19 5	1,562 1,440 36 31 3	123 299 9 15 1	10 37 1 2 0	17,403 7,255 144 87 19
Etowah						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	31,942 6,136 290 22 31	403 513 10 0 1	18 60 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	262 33 2 0 0	32,625 6,742 303 22 32
Jackson						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	14,666 5,067 96 9 14	664 959 8 1 1	35 187 2 0 0	1 1 0 0 0	138 57 2 0 0	15,504 6,271 108 10 15
Jefferson						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	206,275 17,315 2,940 216 310	86 82 6 0	3 3 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	206,364 17,400 2,946 216 311
Other	510	1	U	U	U	311

 Table 46: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Limestone						
Single Family	19,471	17	1	0	0	19,489
Other Residential	4,611	45	2	0	0	4,658
Commercial	106	0	0	0	0	106
Industrial	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	24	0	0	0	0	24
Madison						
Single Family	93,692	193	7	0	0	93,892
Other Residential	10,713	206	13	0	0	10,932
Commercial	1,112	9	1	0	0	1,122
Industrial	204	1	0	0	0	205
Other	185	1	0	0	0	186
Marshall						
Single Family	24,265	193	7	0	0	24,465
Other Residential	6,561	456	46	0	0	7,063
Commercial	230	7	1	0	0	238
Industrial	54	1	0	0	0	55
Other	21	1	0	0	0	22
Morgan						
Single Family	33,701	40	1	0	0	33,742
Other Residential	6,918	107	6	0	0	7,031
Commercial	365	2	0	0	0	367
Industrial	78	0	0	0	0	78
Other	42	0	0	0	0	42
Saint Clair						
Single Family	16,709	42	1	0	0	16,752
Other Residential	9,044	214	13	0	0	9,271
Commercial	112	1	0	0	0	113
Industrial	38	0	0	0	0	38
Other	28	0	0	0	0	28
Talladega						
Single Family	20,454	19	1	0	0	20,474
Other Residential	9,559	113	5	0	0	9,677
Commercial	173	1	0	0	0	174
Industrial	18	0	0	0	0	18
Other	17	0	0	0	0	17

*Note: The summation of the individual buildings damage at different damage levels may not sum to the total amount of buildings damaged; this is due to rounding discrepancies.

	Te4e1 #	Da	y 1	D	ay 3	Da	ny 7	Day	y 30	Da	y 90
Counties	of Beds	# of Beds	%								
Blount	40	40	100.00	40	100.00	40	100.00	40	100.00	40	100.00
Calhoun	745	744	99.87	744	99.87	744	99.87	744	99.87	744	99.87
Cherokee	60	52	86.67	52	86.67	58	96.67	60	100.00	60	100.00
Dekalb	134	22	16.42	23	17.16	59	44.03	121	90.30	127	94.78
Etowah	735	689	93.74	690	93.88	707	96.19	710	96.60	713	97.01
Jackson	170	164	96.47	165	97.06	169	99.41	170	100.00	170	100.00
Jefferson	5,788	5,787	99.98	5,787	99.98	5,787	99.98	5,787	99.98	5,787	99.98
Limestone	101	101	100.00	101	100.00	101	100.00	101	100.00	101	100.00
Madison	991	990	99.90	990	99.90	990	99.90	990	99.90	990	99.90
Marshall	240	237	98.75	237	98.75	240	100.00	240	100.00	240	100.00
Morgan	715	714	99.86	714	99.86	714	99.86	714	99.86	714	99.86
Saint Clair	82	82	100.00	82	100.00	82	100.00	82	100.00	82	100.00
Talladega	298	298	100.00	298	100.00	298	100.00	298	100.00	298	100.00

Table 47: Hospital Functionality

* Note: Discrepancies between the number of hospital beds and the percentage of beds may occur due to rounding.

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Blount	161	99.86	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Calhoun	357	99.68	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Cherokee	85	87.88	96.69	97.81	99.56	99.85
Dekalb	266	69.04	85.51	89.44	97.40	99.49
Etowah	293	98.54	99.78	99.86	99.90	99.90
Jackson	229	96.44	99.44	99.69	99.90	99.90
Jefferson	1,681	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Limestone	184	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Madison	649	99.82	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Marshall	255	99.12	99.87	99.90	99.90	99.90
Morgan	442	99.89	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Saint Clair	310	99.86	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Talladega	268	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90

Table 48: Communication Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Blount	7	96.43
Calhoun	10	94.79
Cherokee	4	41.90
Dekalb	14	34.67
Etowah	12	91.47
Jackson	10	79.31
Jefferson	46	98.89
Limestone	5	98.14
Madison	16	96.30
Marshall	9	91.06
Morgan	9	97.52
Saint Clair	12	96.89
Talladega	7	98.20

Table 49: Police Station Functionality

Table 50: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Blount	18	96.92
Calhoun	45	95.11
Cherokee	8	45.43
Dekalb	18	33.26
Etowah	46	87.60
Jackson	30	79.06
Jefferson	253	98.95
Limestone	26	98.14
Madison	107	96.49
Marshall	36	91.83
Morgan	46	97.61
Saint Clair	29	96.76
Talladega	36	98.05

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Blount	22	96.91
Calhoun	23	94.54
Cherokee	13	53.02
Dekalb	29	35.97
Etowah	32	86.42
Jackson	27	80.11
Jefferson	106	98.94
Limestone	20	98.26
Madison	46	96.34
Marshall	23	91.51
Morgan	34	97.48
Saint Clair	23	96.56
Talladega	21	98.23

Table 51: Fire Station Functionality

Table 52: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Blount	19,265	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Calhoun	45,307	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Cherokee	9,719	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Dekalb	25,113	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Etowah	41,615	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Jackson	21,615	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Jefferson	263,265	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Limestone	24,688	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Madison	109,955	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Marshall	32,547	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Morgan	43,602	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Saint Clair	24,143	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Talladega	30,674	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Blount	3	95.8%	4.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Calhoun	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cherokee	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dekalb	1	4.9%	25.8%	43.5%	21.6%	4.2%
Etowah	2	82.2%	15.9%	1.8%	0.1%	0.0%
Jackson	2	70.3%	24.6%	4.8%	0.3%	0.0%
Jefferson	3	99.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Limestone	1	99.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Madison	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Marshall	2	86.2%	12.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Saint Clair	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Talladega	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 53: Potable Water Facility Damage

Table 54: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Blount	3	96.1%	3.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Calhoun	6	90.9%	8.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Cherokee	3	27.5%	40.1%	25.6%	5.9%	0.8%
Dekalb	7	29.7%	38.8%	25.1%	5.7%	0.7%
Etowah	9	79.7%	17.4%	2.8%	0.1%	0.0%
Jackson	12	68.9%	24.7%	5.9%	0.5%	0.0%
Jefferson	20	99.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Limestone	5	98.6%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Madison	16	96.1%	3.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Marshall	16	87.4%	11.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Morgan	8	97.6%	2.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Saint Clair	8	96.4%	3.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Talladega	17	98.7%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Counties	# of Bridges	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Blount	178	99.91%	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Calhoun	288	99.56%	0.42%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%
Cherokee	159	90.66%	6.78%	0.91%	0.82%	0.82%
Dekalb	287	89.23%	8.04%	1.23%	1.07%	0.41%
Etowah	209	98.34%	1.48%	0.04%	0.09%	0.03%
Jackson	270	96.41%	3.32%	0.14%	0.12%	0.01%
Jefferson	958	99.99%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Limestone	299	99.96%	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Madison	567	99.84%	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Marshall	165	99.32%	0.65%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%
Morgan	239	99.95%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Saint Clair	163	99.88%	0.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Talladega	232	99.96%	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 55: Highway Bridge Damage

Table 56: Highway Bridge Functionality

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Blount	178	99.96	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.98
Calhoun	288	99.86	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97
Cherokee	159	95.97	97.95	98.29	98.41	98.88
Dekalb	287	95.59	97.97	98.44	98.60	99.17
Etowah	209	99.42	99.80	99.82	99.83	99.88
Jackson	270	98.88	99.75	99.80	99.82	99.88
Jefferson	958	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97
Limestone	299	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97
Madison	567	99.94	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97
Marshall	165	99.78	99.95	99.95	99.95	99.95
Morgan	239	99.97	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.98
Saint Clair	163	99.95	99.97	99.97	99.97	99.97
Talladega	232	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.98	99.98
Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks			
-------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------			
Blount	1,905	2	0			
Calhoun	2,344	3	1			
Cherokee	1,517	32	8			
Dekalb	2,588	98	24			
Etowah	2,052	7	8			
Jackson	2,151	14	21			
Jefferson	5,801	2	1			
Limestone	1,591	1	0			
Madison	2,876	3	1			
Marshall	1,964	4	1			
Morgan	1,752	1	0			
Saint Clair	1,961	2	0			
Talladega	2,399	1	0			

 Table 57: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Table 58: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Blount	19,265	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Calhoun	45,307	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cherokee	9,719	19.31	9.41	2.41	0.29	0.03
Dekalb	25,113	21.95	13.75	5.90	1.28	0.03
Etowah	41,615	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jackson	21,615	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jefferson	263,265	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Limestone	24,688	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	109,955	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marshall	32,547	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Morgan	43,602	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Clair	24,143	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Talladega	30,674	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Blount	1,143	1	0
Calhoun	1,407	2	1
Cherokee	910	25	6
Dekalb	1,553	77	19
Etowah	1,231	5	6
Jackson	1,290	11	17
Jefferson	3,480	2	0
Limestone	954	1	0
Madison	1,726	2	1
Marshall	1,179	3	1
Morgan	1,051	1	0
Saint Clair	1,177	1	0
Talladega	1,439	1	0

 Table 59: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Arkansas – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 75 counties in the State of Arkansas. Arkansas is approximately 53,200 square miles and is bordered by Missouri to the north, Louisiana to the south, Tennessee and Mississippi to the east and Oklahoma to the west. For the purposes of this analysis, 34 critical counties have been identified in the northeastern portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 34 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document. The critical counties are listed below:

- Arkansas
- Baxter
- Clay
- Cleburne
- Cleveland
- Craighead
- Crittenden
- Cross
- Desha

- Faulkner
- Fulton
- Grant
- Greene
- Independence
- Izard
- Jackson
- Jefferson
- Lawrence

- Lee

- Randolph
- St. Francis
- Sharp
- Stone
- Van Buren
- White
- Woodruff



Figure 3: Scenario Fault Location for the State of Arkansas

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Arkansas employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The scenario consists of a $M_w 7.7$ earthquake along the southwest extension of the presumed New Madrid Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey

- Lincoln • Lonoke
 - Mississippi
 - Monroe
 - Phillips
 - Poinsett
 - Prairie
 - Pulaski

(USGS) for the middle fault in the proposed New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ). Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northern, central and southern. Based on the recommendation of the Arkansas State Geologic Survey the southwest segment of the middle fault is taken as the worst case scenario for the State of Arkansas.

As with Alabama, residential structures and wood construction are the most prevalent types on buildings in Arkansas. Of the roughly 50,000 completely damaged buildings 98% are residential structures. Over 70% of all completely damaged buildings are single family homes. An additional 61,500 buildings incur moderate or severe damage. Approximately 60,000 of these buildings are residential structures, which contributes to over 110,000 residential buildings with moderate or more severe damage. All cases of complete damage occur in the 34 critical counties and nearly all moderate and severe damage occurs there as well. With this much damage concentrated in the northeast corner of Arkansas many residents will be displaced.

G			
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage
Single Family	936,609	38,644	35,742
Other Residential	195,818	21,792	13,626
Commercial	8,078	796	555
Industrial	1,461	155	174
Other	1,169	102	62
Total	1,143,135	61,489	50,159

Table 60: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Arkansas

Table 61: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 34 Critical Counties

General Occupancy Type Damage (34 Critical Counties)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	462,154	38,342	35,742			
Other Residential	93,812	20,287	13,626			
Commercial	4,406	781	555			
Industrial	815	153	174			
Other	706	96	62			
Total	561,893	59,659	50,159			

Wood buildings comprise a much greater proportion of total building damage in Arkansas than they did in Alabama. Nearly 60% of all complete damage occurs in wood buildings and over 50% of all moderate and more severe damage cases. Mobile homes and unreinforced masonry contribute almost entirely to the remaining damage. Roughly 30,000 cases of at least moderate damage are attributed to mobile homes and another 20,000 attributed to unreinforced masonry buildings. Steel, concrete, precast concrete and reinforced masonry contribute only a small portion of damage cases at each severity level, largely due to the lack of inventory.

Building Damage by Building Type						
Building Type	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete	
Wood	718,424	58,893	22,688	6,744	28,425	
Steel	2,398	295	218	152	332	
Concrete	776	92	58	47	81	
Precast	820	97	89	53	100	
Reinforced Masonry	444	35	33	28	65	
Unreinforced Masonry	96,398	13,474	7,340	4,011	9,334	
Mobile Home	115,965	23,376	12,704	7,324	11,822	
Total	935,225	96,262	43,130	18,359	50,159	

 Table 62: Building Damage by Building Type for State of Arkansas

Essential facilities include hospitals, schools, emergency operation centers (EOCs), police stations and fire stations. The severe shaking in eastern Arkansas counties generates numerous cases of damage to essential facilities. Of the 1,330 fire stations in the State of Arkansas, 151 are at least moderately damaged with 63 of those being completely damaged. All of these damaged facilities are located in the 34 critical counties in the northeast portion of the state. Nearly 200 school and 100 police stations are at least moderately damage. This equates to roughly 15% of all schools and 20% of all police stations in Arkansas.

The operational capabilities of essential facilities are also reduced, particularly in the 34 critical counties. Within northeastern Arkansas alone, nearly 200 fire stations and 250 schools are not functioning the day after the earthquake. Additionally, over 100 police stations are not operational. Limited functionality of facilities will likely limit the emergency services provided by firefighters and law enforcement officers in the chaotic aftermath of a catastrophic earthquake. Furthermore, schools that are frequently used as public shelters will not be available in some of the heavily damaged areas.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (State)						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	Functionality >50% at Day 1				
Hospitals	103	18	10	63		
Schools	1,254	188	106	995		
EOCs	11	1	1	10		
Police Stations	515	94	43	398		
Fire Stations	1,330	151	63	1,139		

Fable 63: Essential Facilitie	s Damage &	Functionality f	or the State	of Arkansas ³
Lable 001 Epseminal Latine	, Dunnage et	i unchonunty i	or the state	of Thi Kalibab

³ For Tables 63-73 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (34 Critical Counties)						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	At Least Moderate Damage Damage >50%)			
Hospitals	49	18	10	10		
Schools	613	188	106	353		
EOCs	5	1	1	4		
Police Stations	267	94	43	150		
Fire Stations	575	151	63	384		

Damage to transportation lifelines is most substantial in northeast Arkansas and the 34 critical counties. Nearly 700 bridges incur at least moderate damage while nearly 300 of those are completely damaged. Nearly 700 bridges are not functioning at full capacity immediately after the earthquake due to the extensive structural damage to bridges in the areas of most intense shaking. The remaining bridges are largely unaffected. Airport damage follows a trend similar to that of bridges. All damaged airport facilities are located in the critical counties, with 36 at least moderately damaged airports. In addition, numerous ports and railway facilities in the northeast portion of the state are damaged and not functioning in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake.

Table 65: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments						
	At Least Total No.Complete ModerateFunctionalityOf BridgesDamage (Damage >50%)50% at Day 1					
34 Critical Counties	2,883	688	290	2,197		
Remaining Counties	2,751	0	0	2,751		
Total State	5,634	688	290	4,948		

Table 66: Airport Damage Assessments

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments					
	Total No. Of Airports	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1	
34 Critical Counties	172	36	5	156	
Remaining Counties	142	0	0	142	
Total State	314	36	5	298	

Transportation System Damage						
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%	
Highway	Segments Bridges Tunnels	2,808 5,634 2	0 688 0	0 290 0	2,808 4,948 2	
Railways	Segments Bridges Tunnels Facilities	3,460 48 0 68	0 4 0 14	0 0 0 0	3,460 44 0 58	
Bus	Facilities	16	1	0	16	
Light Rail	Segments Bridges Facilities	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	
Ferry	Facilities	1	1	1	0	
Port	Facilities	99	17	7	88	
Airport	Facilities Runways	314 238	36 0	5 0	298 238	

 Table 67: Transportation System Damage for State of Arkansas

Communication and waste water facilities incur the most cases of damage with approximately 60 at least moderately damaged facilities each. All cases of damage occur in the critical counties, severely inhibiting the operation of these facilities and other utility facilities in the same area. Nearly 125 waste water facilities are not operating the day after the earthquake. Another 30 communication facilities and 10 electric power facilities are not functioning over the same period of time. This loss of functionality will inhibit the services provided to residents in the areas with the most sever damage.

Table 68: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Potable Water Facilities	Functionality >50% at Day 1					
34 Critical Counties	31	2	1	29			
Remaining Counties	38	0	0	38			
Total State	69	2	1	67			

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Waste Water Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1			
34 Critical Counties	229	66	6	105			
Remaining Counties	182	0	0	182			
Total State	411	66	6	287			

Table 70: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Natural Gas Facilities	Total No. of Natural Gas FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functional >50% at Damage					
34 Critical Counties	18	2	0	16			
Remaining Counties	79	0	0	79			
Total State	97	2	0	95			

Table 71: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functional >50% at Da						
34 Critical Counties	5	2	0	2			
Remaining Counties	5	0	0	5			
Total State	10	2	0	7			

Table 72: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Electric Power Facilities	Total No. of Electric Power FacilitiesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageDamage (Damage >50%)Damage >50%)				
34 Critical Counties	29	8	1	18		
Remaining Counties	27	0	0	27		
Total State	56	8	1	45		

Table 73: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	Total No. ofAt Least ModerateCompleteCommunicationDamageDamageFacilities(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)					
34 Critical Counties	284	59	5	253			
Remaining Counties	341	0	0	341			
Total State	625	59	5	594			

There are several hundred thousand miles of local distribution lines in the State of Arkansas and many networks in the critical counties are severely impacted. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at over 29,500 and 19,500, respectively. Local natural gas lines, however; show the greatest break and leak rates per length of pipe at roughly 0.22 leaks/mile (1 leak every 4.6 miles) or 0.32 breaks/mile (roughly 1 break every 3.1 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of 16,756 leaks and 26,481 breaks over the combined length of 86,153 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off for over 175,000 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This is reduced to 171,200 residences within a week and nearly 80,000 customers are still without service after three months. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. This period of time without water prevents tens of thousands of people from remaining in their homes in the weeks and months following the earthquake. Electric power service shows similar trends, with about 95,000 service outages the day after the earthquake, or over 9% of all state residences. Even a month after the earthquake over 13,500 residences are still without power. Electric power lines are presumed to be above ground and less likely to incur damage from moderate ground shaking unlike buried pipelines that are vulnerable to damage from liquefaction and ground deformation.

Pipeline Damage							
System Total Pipelines (mi) No. Leaks No. Breaks							
Potable Water - Local	191,084	19,677	29,763				
Waste Water - Local	114,650	15,563	23,540				
Natural Gas - Regional	9,719	393	1,317				
Natural Gas - Local	76,434	16,636	25,164				
Oil - Regional	2,171	89	335				

Table 74: Pipeline Damage

 Table 75: Utility Service Interruptions

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service							
	No. Households Day 1 Day 3 Day 7 Day 30 Day 90						
Potable Water	1 0/2 696	175,565	174,382	171,216	132,672	79,737	
Electric Power	1,042,696	95,309	68,561	39,398	13,541	112	

A NOTE ON THE DETERMINATION OF DAMAGE TO INFRASTRUCTURE:

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in the report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county.

The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (3) and employed for the preceding damage tables. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Mississippi County, Arkansas 147 Highway Bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 3:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 147 at least moderately damaged highway bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of 133 at least moderately damaged highway bridges

In the case of Mississippi County, Arkansas, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a lower estimate of damage as opposed to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (3). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Arkansas are estimated to incur greater damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges for the 34 critical counties in Arkansas shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 774 at least moderately damaged highway bridges
- Total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 688 at least moderately damaged highway bridges

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces greater damage when summed for the 34 critical counties. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix for the NMSZ scenario in Arkansas.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Arkansas. These tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of the four damage levels for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Arkansas	(1(0110)	(Signe)	(110401400)	(Lintensitie)	(complete)	1000
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	6,984 288 14 2 3	950 266 15 2 2	119 322 13 2 3	5 489 9 2 2	0 90 3 0 0	8,058 1,455 54 8 10
Baxter						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	16,077 3,391 119 28 15	102 317 3 1 0	7 39 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	16,186 3,747 122 29 15
Clav						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	1,726 15 0 0 0	2,883 83 3 1 0	1,356 281 9 2 1	296 306 8 2 1	1,225 234 6 2 0	7,486 919 26 7 2
Cleburne						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	10,485 2,588 80 21 9	227 492 3 1 0	25 182 0 0 0	1 4 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	10,738 3,266 83 22 9
Cleveland						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	2,615 434 2 1 2	356 367 1 0 0	44 205 0 0 0	2 5 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	3,017 1,011 3 1 2
Craighead						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	2,179 91 0 0 0	9,693 432 6 2 2	8,301 907 68 12 4	1,726 1,193 135 27 9	6,021 1,974 212 56 18	27,920 4,597 421 97 33
Crittenden						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	3,680 148 1 0 1	5,062 182 4 0 2	1,995 240 21 1 3	434 559 32 3 3	4,371 1,812 74 19 10	15,542 2,941 132 23 19

Table 76: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Cross						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial	1,647 37 0	1,994 51 2	717 215 9	175 528 12	1,327 1,169 19	5,860 2,000 42
Industrial Other	0 1	0 1	0 2	1 4	4 7	5 15
Desha						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	4,565 621 28 8 9	466 323 10 2 3	58 169 4 1 1	3 4 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	5,092 1,117 42 11 13
Faulkner						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	25,441 6,920 230 83 55	162 599 6 2 1	11 73 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	25,614 7,592 237 85 56
Fulton						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	4,834 1,162 25 13 4	31 113 1 0 0	2 14 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	4,867 1,289 26 13 4
Grant						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	4,954 1,668 16 3 2	174 405 0 0 0	20 169 0 0 0	1 4 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	5,149 2,246 16 3 2
Greene						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	1,181 32 1 0 0	5,117 214 9 0 1	4,281 727 30 2 2	839 828 28 4 2	1,961 760 26 7 1	13,379 2,561 94 13 6
Independence						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	10,526 1,341 61 3 5	1,432 1,079 26 2 2	179 599 11 1	8 14 1 0	0 0 0 0	12,145 3,033 99 6 8

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Izard	(1,0110)	(01910)	(110001000)	(2000000000000)	(001111100)	20002
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	5,057 1,336 45 5 7	32 131 1 0 0	2 16 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	5,091 1,483 46 5 7
Jackson		Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	0	,
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	2,218 75 1 0 0	2,082 135 6 0 0	580 312 17 0 1	179 298 13 0 2	1,542 256 17 0 1	6,601 1,076 54 0 4
Jefferson						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	24,397 2,288 120 19 25	3,319 1,647 51 9 9	414 895 21 4 3	19 22 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	28,149 4,852 193 32 37
Lawrence						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	3,696 304 2 1 0	1,725 272 4 0 0	427 209 8 1 1	120 74 6 1 1	1,149 79 7 1 1	7,117 938 27 4 3
Lee						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	1,132 42 0 0 0	1,062 90 1 0 0	296 241 3 0 1	91 233 2 0 0	885 253 3 0 1	3,466 859 9 0 2
Lincoln						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	2,950 713 9 2 4	401 583 4 1 1	50 325 1 1 1	2 8 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	3,403 1,629 14 4 6
Lonoke						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	14,602 1,871 38 8 9	2,531 1,470 20 4 4	307 864 10 4 1	14 176 4 3 0	130 88 1 1 0	17,584 4,469 73 20 14

89	(~	()	()	(
89					
3	636 29	3,231 196	4,251 408	8,327 3,517	16,534 4,153
0	0	0	2	108	110
0	0	0	0	19	19
0	0	0	0	14	14
2,565 163 3 1	838 194 4 1	192 300 7 1	50 370 5 1	10 66 1 0	3,655 1,093 20 4
1	1	2	1	0	5
5,494 394 9 1 2	1,198 247 10 1 2	231 254 12 1 2	52 345 8 1 2	1,417 325 9 2 1	8,392 1,565 48 6 9
521 6 0 0	1,658 43 0 0	1,996 128 2 0 1	1,110 284 5 1	3,458 1,433 44 46 5	8,743 1,894 51 47 7
0	Ŭ	-	-	C C	
3,237 187 4 0 3	440 201 4 0 2	55 250 3 1 2	3 382 2 1 2	0 71 1 0 0	3,735 1,091 14 2 9
115,814 9,898 1,338 153 238	12,843 3,781 418 61 71	1,564 1,792 171 33 26	71 45 12 3 1	2 0 0 0 0	130,294 15,516 1,939 250 336
4,493 419 3 1	1,661 369 4 1	381 224 9 5	100 43 6 6	470 112 2 2	7,105 1,167 24 15
	$ $	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Saint Francis						
Single Family	3,129	2,936	818	254	1,019	8,156
Other Residential	127	252	674	714	496	2,263
Commercial	1	6	17	12	8	44
Industrial	0	3	9	9	10	31
Other	1	1	1	0	0	3
Sharp						
Single Family	7,318	720	89	4	0	8,131
Other Residential	864	312	151	3	0	1,330
Commercial	39	15	6	0	0	60
Industrial	3	1	1	0	0	5
Other	7	2	1	0	0	10
Stone						
Single Family	4,328	28	2	0	0	4,358
Other Residential	1,275	125	15	0	0	1,415
Commercial	46	1	0	0	0	47
Industrial	7	0	0	0	0	7
Other	10	0	0	0	0	10
Van Buren						
Single Family	6,875	44	3	0	0	6,922
Other Residential	1,859	179	22	0	0	2,060
Commercial	41	1	0	0	0	42
Industrial	9	0	0	0	0	9
Other	16	0	0	0	0	16
White						
Single Family	16,279	2,172	363	61	1,618	20,493
Other Residential	2,723	1,543	1,102	427	681	6,476
Commercial	117	37	17	3	11	185
Industrial	14	7	4	1	4	30
Other	9	2	1	0	1	13
Woodruff						
Single Family	1,035	972	271	84	810	3,172
Other Residential	24	66	206	203	210	709
Commercial	0	1	3	2	3	9
Industrial	0	0	0	1	1	2
Other	0	0	1	1	2	4

	Total #	Da	ay 1	Da	ay 3	Da	ay 7	Da	y 30	Day	y 90
Counties	of Beds	# of Beds	%								
Arkansas	74	13	17.00	13	17.50	29	39.80	64	86.60	69	93.20
Baxter	268	258	96.40	259	96.50	266	99.30	268	99.90	268	99.90
Clay	25	0	0.40	0	0.40	1	2.60	7	28.80	14	55.20
Cleburne	25	24	96.40	24	96.50	25	99.30	25	99.90	25	99.90
Cleveland	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Craighead	594	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	2.00	82	13.80
Crittenden	152	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	17	10.90
Cross	15	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1.60	2	10.90
Desha	60	43	72.05	43	72.40	52	86.45	59	98.75	60	99.35
Faulkner	149	144	96.40	144	96.50	148	99.30	149	99.90	149	99.90
Fulton	25	24	96.40	24	96.50	25	99.30	25	99.90	25	99.90
Grant	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Greene	129	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.00	18	13.80
Independence	185	88	47.70	89	48.30	136	73.60	181	97.60	183	98.80
Izard	25	24	96.40	24	96.50	25	99.30	25	99.90	25	99.90
Jackson	133	0	0.30	0	0.30	3	2.00	30	22.60	58	43.60
Jefferson	446	213	47.70	215	48.30	328	73.60	435	97.60	441	98.80
Lawrence	25	0	0.30	0	0.30	1	2.00	6	22.60	11	43.60
Lee	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Lincoln	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Lonoke	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Mississippi	193	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Monroe	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Phillips	155	20	12.70	20	13.10	46	29.80	101	65.00	108	69.90
Poinsett	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Prairie	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Pulaski	3,888	1993	51.26	2015	51.82	2934	75.47	3801	97.77	3845	98.88
Randolph	50	0	0.40	0	0.50	1	2.70	15	30.20	29	58.10
St. Francis	118	0	0.40	0	0.40	3	2.60	34	29.10	66	56.10
Sharp	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Stone	25	24	96.40	24	96.50	25	99.30	25	99.90	25	99.90
Van Buren	25	24	96.40	24	96.50	25	99.30	25	99.90	25	99.90
White	438	209	47.70	212	48.30	322	73.60	427	97.60	433	98.80
Woodruff	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Table 77: Hospital Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Arkansas	8	51.90
Baxter	6	94.10
Clay	5	0.56
Cleburne	6	80.03
Cleveland	3	51.90
Craighead	13	0.09
Crittenden	14	0.14
Cross	4	0.25
Desha	10	56.12
Faulkner	10	94.10
Fulton	4	94.10
Grant	2	94.10
Greene	4	0.50
Independence	2	51.90
Izard	3	94.10
Jackson	8	0.60
Jefferson	12	51.90
Lawrence	5	21.12
Lee	2	0.60
Lincoln	4	51.90
Lonoke	9	49.58
Mississippi	12	0.00
Monroe	6	34.90
Phillips	6	36.85
Poinsett	7	0.07
Prairie	4	51.90
Pulaski	57	53.74
Randolph	3	0.70
St. Francis	8	0.65
Sharp	7	63.96
Stone	2	94.10
Van Buren	3	94.10
White	12	47.08
Woodruff	6	0.60

Table 78: Police Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Arkansas	13	51.90
Baxter	10	94.10
Clay	7	0.43
Cleburne	12	83.55
Cleveland	5	51.90
Craighead	39	0.06
Crittenden	27	0.30
Cross	7	0.29
Desha	10	68.78
Faulkner	38	94.10
Fulton	5	94.10
Grant	6	94.10
Greene	17	0.20
Independence	20	51.90
Izard	9	94.10
Jackson	7	0.60
Jefferson	40	51.90
Lawrence	14	29.39
Lee	7	6.07
Lincoln	3	51.90
Lonoke	22	48.72
Mississippi	30	0.00
Monroe	5	31.50
Phillips	15	39.86
Poinsett	14	0.07
Prairie	5	51.90
Pulaski	142	57.37
Randolph	10	22.10
St. Francis	13	0.62
Sharp	8	73.00
Stone	6	94.10
Van Buren	8	94.10
White	34	52.38
Woodruff	5	0.60

Table 79: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Arkansas	13	51.90
Baxter	25	94.10
Clay	11	0.49
Cleburne	19	82.99
Cleveland	10	51.90
Craighead	24	0.19
Crittenden	17	0.24
Cross	7	0.21
Desha	9	65.97
Faulkner	28	94.10
Fulton	13	94.10
Grant	11	82.59
Greene	11	0.38
Independence	19	51.22
Izard	12	94.10
Jackson	12	0.60
Jefferson	23	51.90
Lawrence	14	25.20
Lee	6	0.60
Lincoln	11	51.90
Lonoke	23	49.23
Mississippi	19	0.00
Monroe	7	44.61
Phillips	12	42.21
Poinsett	9	0.17
Prairie	14	50.04
Pulaski	68	62.35
Randolph	11	32.99
St. Francis	8	0.61
Sharp	17	66.79
Stone	22	94.10
Van Buren	24	94.10
White	40	44.16
Woodruff	6	0.60

Table 80: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Arkansas	8	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Baxter	12	98.15	99.65	99.78	99.90	99.90
Clay	5	59.10	77.26	81.76	92.10	98.54
Cleburne	4	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Cleveland	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Craighead	18	50.37	72.41	79.09	93.68	98.83
Crittenden	9	48.64	66.72	72.39	86.64	97.59
Cross	4	51.13	71.65	77.68	91.45	98.45
Desha	4	98.15	99.65	99.78	99.90	99.90
Faulkner	8	98.15	99.65	99.78	99.90	99.90
Fulton	2	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Grant	9	95.40	99.23	99.57	99.90	99.90
Greene	4	53.30	76.30	82.80	96.30	99.30
Independence	29	91.12	98.18	98.90	99.81	99.89
Izard	2	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Jackson	2	76.25	91.35	93.45	97.45	99.50
Jefferson	23	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Lawrence	8	74.10	88.70	90.80	95.40	99.10
Lee	2	74.10	88.70	90.80	95.40	99.10
Lincoln	1	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Lonoke	6	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Mississippi	12	24.63	35.57	44.74	71.48	94.92
Monroe	2	78.40	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Phillips	7	77.17	92.49	94.59	98.33	99.67
Poinsett	5	29.56	43.90	53.12	78.08	96.10
Prairie	2	74.10	88.70	90.80	95.40	99.10
Pulaski	62	96.61	99.42	99.66	99.90	99.90
Randolph	4	77.33	92.68	94.78	98.48	99.70
St. Francis	4	63.23	83.53	87.68	96.13	99.28
Sharp	3	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Stone	8	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Van Buren	3	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
White	11	83.00	94.82	96.34	98.90	99.75
Woodruff	1	74.10	88.70	90.80	95.40	99.10

Table 81: Communication Functionality

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Arkansas	8,457	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Baxter	17,052	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clay	7,417	97.90	97.64	96.98	83.43	0.00
Cleburne	10,190	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cleveland	3,273	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Craighead	32,301	99.78	99.77	99.75	99.54	96.69
Crittenden	18,471	99.87	99.86	99.84	99.68	95.50
Cross	7,391	99.81	99.80	99.77	99.34	23.43
Desha	5,922	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Faulkner	31,882	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fulton	4,810	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grant	6,241	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	14,750	98.81	98.69	98.41	94.14	0.00
Independence	13,467	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Izard	5,440	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jackson	6,971	97.04	96.61	95.50	63.29	0.00
Jefferson	30,555	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lawrence	7,108	90.49	88.51	82.75	0.00	0.00
Lee	4,182	98.18	97.92	97.25	78.12	0.00
Lincoln	4,265	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lonoke	19,262	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mississippi	19,349	99.94	99.94	99.93	99.90	99.61
Monroe	4,105	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Phillips	9,711	86.58	84.23	77.84	0.00	0.00
Poinsett	10,026	99.90	99.89	99.88	99.79	98.34
Prairie	3,894	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pulaski	147,942	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Randolph	7,265	81.36	77.14	64.69	0.00	0.00
St. Francis	10,043	98.76	98.65	98.38	94.81	0.00
Sharp	7,211	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stone	4,768	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Van Buren	6,825	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
White	25,148	84.76	83.16	79.30	21.29	0.00
Woodruff	3,531	98.19	97.93	97.28	79.33	0.00

Table 82: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Counties	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Arkansas	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Baxter	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Clay	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cleburne	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Cleveland	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Craighead	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Crittenden	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cross	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Desha	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Faulkner	3	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Fulton	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Grant	2	73.3%	20.4%	5.8%	0.5%	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Independence	1	49.6%	37.3%	11.3%	1.0%	0.8%
Izard	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Jackson	2	18.4%	39.3%	28.7%	6.1%	7.6%
Jefferson	2	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Lawrence	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lee	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lonoke	3	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Mississippi	2	0.3%	4.5%	19.9%	33.2%	42.1%
Monroe	1	19.7%	42.2%	30.8%	6.6%	0.7%
Phillips	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Poinsett	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Prairie	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pulaski	7	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Randolph	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Francis	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sharp	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Stone	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Van Buren	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	3	29.4%	39.7%	23.6%	4.5%	2.8%
Woodruff	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 83: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Arkansas	2,019	87	22
Baxter	1,634	9	2
Clay	1,342	541	1,244
Cleburne	1,390	8	2
Cleveland	995	24	6
Craighead	2,085	2,094	3,852
Crittenden	1,552	1,828	3,306
Cross	1,212	1,033	2,355
Desha	1,266	48	12
Faulkner	1,828	10	2
Fulton	1,345	7	2
Grant	1,453	8	2
Greene	1,472	669	1,648
Independence	1,567	22	5
Izard	1,267	7	2
Jackson	1,234	411	1,015
Jefferson	2,429	90	23
Lawrence	1,143	225	586
Lee	1,122	418	1,100
Lincoln	1,102	47	12
Lonoke	1,993	74	34
Mississippi	2,082	6,307	5,503
Monroe	1,069	123	31
Phillips	1,446	280	622
Poinsett	1,716	3,179	3,944
Prairie	1,297	56	14
Pulaski	3,414	38	10
Randolph	1,233	139	449
St. Francis	1,633	754	1,798
Sharp	1,387	8	2
Stone	1,104	6	2
Van Buren	1,543	8	2
White	2,388	326	945
Woodruff	1,141	425	1,119

 Table 84: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Arkansas	8,457	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Baxter	17,052	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clay	7,417	49.79	30.24	12.00	2.74	0.07
Cleburne	10,190	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cleveland	3,273	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Craighead	32,301	83.37	56.82	28.43	8.55	0.10
Crittenden	18,471	81.20	55.59	30.85	11.14	0.10
Cross	7,391	76.94	48.21	24.00	8.48	0.09
Desha	5,922	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Faulkner	31,882	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fulton	4,810	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grant	6,241	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	14,750	80.47	51.11	22.31	5.88	0.10
Independence	13,467	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Izard	5,440	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jackson	6,971	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jefferson	30,555	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lawrence	7,108	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lee	4,182	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lincoln	4,265	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lonoke	19,262	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mississippi	19,349	94.93	84.98	63.88	24.83	0.10
Monroe	4,105	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Phillips	9,711	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Poinsett	10,026	91.19	75.58	51.56	19.01	0.10
Prairie	3,894	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pulaski	147,942	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Randolph	7,265	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
St. Francis	10,043	46.02	25.64	10.27	3.12	0.06
Sharp	7,211	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stone	4,768	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Van Buren	6,825	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
White	25,148	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Woodruff	3,531	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 85: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Arkansas	6	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Baxter	4	71.6%	22.0%	5.9%	0.5%	0.0%
Clay	10	8.5%	26.6%	33.4%	14.6%	17.0%
Cleburne	2	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Cleveland	3	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Craighead	11	2.4%	15.4%	33.8%	24.6%	23.8%
Crittenden	9	3.5%	17.7%	33.3%	22.1%	23.5%
Cross	5	4.3%	20.8%	34.7%	18.8%	21.3%
Desha	6	57.8%	31.9%	9.5%	0.8%	0.1%
Faulkner	8	85.0%	11.8%	3.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Fulton	2	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Grant	2	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Greene	4	3.2%	19.5%	37.7%	21.5%	18.1%
Independence	4	18.7%	40.0%	29.2%	6.2%	5.9%
Izard	6	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Jackson	8	18.4%	39.3%	28.7%	6.1%	7.6%
Jefferson	9	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Lawrence	9	18.7%	39.9%	29.2%	6.2%	6.1%
Lee	4	18.4%	39.3%	28.7%	6.1%	7.6%
Lincoln	3	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Lonoke	8	50.0%	37.6%	11.3%	1.0%	0.2%
Mississippi	15	0.2%	2.8%	16.7%	35.0%	45.3%
Monroe	3	19.7%	42.2%	30.8%	6.6%	0.7%
Phillips	7	22.9%	39.0%	26.2%	5.4%	6.5%
Poinsett	9	2.6%	11.6%	23.1%	26.7%	36.0%
Prairie	5	43.9%	38.5%	15.2%	2.1%	0.2%
Pulaski	28	51.7%	36.4%	11.0%	0.9%	0.1%
Randolph	5	18.9%	40.4%	29.5%	6.3%	4.8%
St. Francis	8	10.2%	31.0%	33.2%	11.0%	14.7%
Sharp	3	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Stone	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Van Buren	6	57.8%	31.9%	9.5%	0.8%	0.1%
White	12	26.5%	39.3%	24.7%	4.9%	4.6%
Woodruff	4	18.4%	39.3%	28.7%	6.1%	7.6%

 Table 86: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (km)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Arkansas	1,212	69	17
Baxter	981	7	2
Clay	805	428	984
Cleburne	834	6	2
Cleveland	597	19	5
Craighead	1,251	1,656	3,046
Crittenden	931	1,445	2,615
Cross	727	817	1,863
Desha	759	38	10
Faulkner	1,097	8	2
Fulton	807	6	1
Grant	872	6	2
Greene	883	529	1,303
Independence	941	17	4
Izard	760	5	1
Jackson	740	325	803
Jefferson	1,457	71	18
Lawrence	686	178	463
Lee	673	330	870
Lincoln	661	37	9
Lonoke	1,196	58	27
Mississippi	1,249	4,988	4,352
Monroe	641	97	24
Phillips	868	222	492
Poinsett	1,030	2,514	3,119
Prairie	778	44	11
Pulaski	2,049	30	8
Randolph	740	110	355
St. Francis	979	596	1,422
Sharp	832	6	1
Stone	662	5	1
Van Buren	926	7	2
White	1,433	257	748
Woodruff	685	336	885

 Table 87: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# of Bridge	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Arkansas	61	71.92%	10.31%	6.58%	7.72%	3.44%
Baxter	24	96.36%	2.34%	0.81%	0.42%	0.06%
Clay	70	52.33%	9.30%	6.24%	7.99%	24.12%
Cleburne	31	96.72%	2.18%	0.68%	0.35%	0.05%
Cleveland	61	95.95%	3.05%	0.63%	0.31%	0.04%
Craighead	124	34.90%	6.42%	6.67%	12.56%	39.42%
Crittenden	147	21.10%	7.78%	7.27%	15.33%	48.49%
Cross	83	31.83%	7.41%	6.83%	13.12%	40.79%
Desha	37	95.41%	2.95%	1.02%	0.54%	0.08%
Faulkner	90	94.23%	3.67%	1.32%	0.67%	0.09%
Fulton	55	94.50%	3.54%	1.24%	0.62%	0.08%
Grant	74	95.35%	3.25%	0.89%	0.44%	0.06%
Greene	79	48.01%	9.84%	6.18%	8.51%	27.43%
Independence	130	92.68%	2.76%	0.64%	0.53%	3.37%
Izard	60	96.23%	2.48%	0.82%	0.41%	0.05%
Jackson	71	51.41%	8.70%	6.06%	6.79%	27.01%
Jefferson	92	96.42%	2.56%	0.63%	0.33%	0.05%
Lawrence	68	66.34%	8.25%	3.05%	3.54%	18.79%
Lee	43	55.49%	8.02%	5.39%	6.74%	24.34%
Lincoln	40	95.48%	3.39%	0.71%	0.35%	0.05%
Lonoke	117	78.18%	10.08%	4.21%	5.08%	2.44%
Mississippi	147	6.01%	3.20%	4.21%	11.50%	75.05%
Monroe	73	67.39%	11.33%	7.60%	9.42%	4.23%
Phillips	45	66.86%	8.12%	5.38%	6.30%	13.32%
Poinsett	95	12.90%	4.00%	4.99%	12.79%	65.30%
Prairie	64	66.55%	10.08%	7.04%	8.20%	8.11%
Pulaski	332	92.14%	6.34%	0.93%	0.50%	0.07%
Randolph	67	71.11%	10.93%	2.45%	3.63%	11.86%
St. Francis	120	34.20%	10.32%	8.90%	13.74%	32.82%
Sharp	63	95.36%	3.27%	0.87%	0.43%	0.06%
Stone	40	93.77%	3.70%	1.58%	0.82%	0.12%
Van Buren	48	96.19%	2.46%	0.85%	0.43%	0.06%
White	181	80.05%	4.05%	1.60%	3.22%	11.07%
Woodruff	51	55.05%	7.61%	5.23%	6.12%	25.96%

Table 88: Highway Bridge Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Arkansas	61	81.82	86.35	88.94	89.99	94.04
Baxter	24	98.31	99.14	99.46	99.51	99.71
Clay	70	61.81	65.98	68.46	69.80	75.38
Cleburne	31	98.51	99.25	99.53	99.57	99.75
Cleveland	61	98.39	99.32	99.58	99.61	99.76
Craighead	124	42.82	46.41	49.13	51.09	59.99
Crittenden	147	30.48	34.61	37.61	39.96	50.85
Cross	83	40.59	44.45	47.25	49.29	58.56
Desha	37	97.89	98.91	99.31	99.39	99.65
Faulkner	90	97.34	98.64	99.17	99.26	99.59
Fulton	55	97.48	98.73	99.22	99.31	99.61
Grant	74	98.00	99.07	99.42	99.48	99.69
Greene	79	57.96	62.25	64.73	66.14	72.22
Independence	128	94.97	95.84	96.10	96.21	96.70
Izard	60	98.28	99.13	99.46	99.51	99.71
Jackson	71	60.41	64.37	66.77	68.02	73.20
Jefferson	92	98.48	99.30	99.55	99.59	99.75
Lawrence	68	73.85	76.82	78.04	78.75	81.76
Lee	43	63.73	67.33	69.47	70.66	75.63
Lincoln	40	98.20	99.24	99.53	99.57	99.74
Lonoke	117	87.12	90.88	92.53	93.21	95.89
Mississippi	147	11.42	13.54	15.39	17.60	28.36
Monroe	73	78.43	83.51	86.50	87.77	92.72
Phillips	45	74.92	78.54	80.68	81.67	85.68
Poinsett	95	19.01	21.53	23.68	25.92	36.66
Prairie	64	76.53	81.13	83.90	85.08	89.67
Pulaski	332	97.14	99.00	99.36	99.44	99.68
Randolph	67	80.31	83.79	84.77	85.37	87.97
St. Francis	119	45.59	50.80	54.37	56.45	65.49
Sharp	63	98.03	99.10	99.44	99.50	99.70
Stone	40	96.98	98.37	98.98	99.11	99.52
Van Buren	48	98.24	99.10	99.43	99.49	99.70
White	180	83.83	85.32	85.97	86.48	88.82
Woodruff	51	62.95	66.39	68.48	69.61	74.38

Table 89: Highway Bridge Functionality

Illinois – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 102 counties in the State of Illinois. Illinois is approximately 56,000 square miles and is bordered by Wisconsin to the north, Iowa and Missouri to the west, Kentucky to the southeast, and Indiana to the east. For the purposes of this analysis, 40 critical counties have been identified in the southern portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 40 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document. The critical counties are listed below:

- Alexander
- Bond
- Calhoun
- Clark
- Clav
- Clinton
- Crawford
- Edwards
- Effingham
- Fayette

- Franklin
- Gallatin
- Greene
- Hamilton
- Hardin
- Jackson
- Jasper
- Jefferson
- Jersey
- Johnson

- Lawrence
- Macoupin

- Pulaski

- Randolph
- Richland
- Saint Clair
- Saline
- Union
- Wabash
- Washington
- Wayne
- White
- Williamson



Figure 4: Location of Fault Rupture for NMSZ Scenario in the State of Illinois

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Illinois employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The scenario consists of a $M_w 7.7$ earthquake along the northern segment of the presumed New Madrid Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for

- Madison
- Marion
- Massac
- Monroe
- Montgomery
- Perry
- Pope

the middle fault in the proposed New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ). Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northern, central and southern. The worst-case scenario for the State of Illinois, the critical counties in particular, is an event on the western fault line in the northern segment, as shown in Figure 4. For more information on the hazard utilized in this scenario please reference Appendix I.

The NMSZ scenario produces thousands of damaged buildings in the State of Illinois. There are nearly 17,000 cases of complete damage which are included in the nearly 30,000 at least moderately damaged buildings. As with previous state scenarios, residential buildings experience the greatest amount of damage. Nearly 99% of all complete damage occurs with residential buildings. This occupancy type also accounts for nearly 99% of at least moderate damage throughout the state. All but three completely damaged buildings are located in the 40 critical counties in southern Illinois. Additionally, 90% of all at least moderate damage occurs in these 40 critical counties.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)							
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage				
Single Family	2,780,853	16,999	11,586				
Other Residential	416,473	12,046	5,087				
Commercial	41,905	352	140				
Industrial	7,466	40	11				
Other	4,515	46	36				
Total	3,251,212	29,483	16,860				

 Table 90: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Illinois

 Table 91: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 40 Critical Counties

General Occupancy Type Damage (40 Critical Counties)							
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage				
Single Family	365,291	14,975	11,586				
Other Residential	73,465	10,752	5,087				
Commercial	3,311	240	138				
Industrial	359	20	10				
Other	646	45	36				
Total	443,072	26,032	16,857				

Wood frame construction is the most common type of building in the State of Illinois and also generates the most cases of complete damage. Nearly half of all complete damage, 7,800 buildings, is experienced by wood frame structures. Unreinforced masonry and mobile homes are estimated to incur the most cases of moderate damage with over 70% moderate damage attributed to these building types. This damage state is identified by significant cracking to unreinforced masonry walls as well as some connection damage to column/beam joints in unreinforced masonry building. The remaining building types

show far less inventory throughout the state and thus experience a far lesser proportion of damage.

Building Damage by Building Type							
Building Type	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete		
Wood	2,315,085	21,686	6,150	2,750	7,819		
Steel	16,145	656	193	15	60		
Concrete	31,516	917	250	44	215		
Precast	5,382	178	71	8	26		
Reinforced Masonry	5,776	78	24	2	15		
Unreinforced Masonry	638,209	38,777	7,430	1,176	4,117		
Mobile Home	107,166	23,298	9,620	1,750	4,608		
Total	3,119,279	85,590	23,738	5,745	16,860		

Table 92: Building Damage by Building Type for the State of Illinois

Of the 1,725 fire stations in the state, 38 (more than 2%) are estimated to experience at least moderate damage. 60 schools are completely damaged while another 23 experience moderate or severe damage. Additionally, over 20 police stations are damaged from the NMSZ event. Two emergency operation centers are expected to sustain this level of damage since they are located in the portion of the state which experiences the most severe shaking. All damage is confined to the 40 critical counties in southern Illinois.

Not only are numerous facilities damaged but a large number of facilities are also not functional in the days immediately after the earthquake. Over 250 schools, 80 fire stations and 50 police stations are not fully functional in the days after the event. This will likely inhibit the ability of law enforcement, fire fighters and medical personnel to assist those in heavily impacted areas.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality								
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities (State)	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage>50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1				
Hospitals	249	3	1	217				
Schools	5,722	83	60	5,464				
EOCs	149	2	2	145				
Police Stations	1,044	21	15	997				
Fire Stations	1,725	38	32	1,645				

Table 93: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for State of Illinois⁴

⁴ For Tables 93-103 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality							
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities (40 Critical Counties)	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage>50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1			
Hospitals	52	3	1	20			
Schools	1,167	83	60	909			
EOCs	31	2	2	27			
Police Stations	267	21	15	220			
Fire Stations	366	38	32	286			

 Table 94: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for Critical Counties

Table 95: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1					
40 Critical Counties	6,554	264	71	6,293				
Remaining Counties	16,300	0	0	16,300				
Total State	22,854	264	71	22,593				

Table 96: Airport Damage Assessments

Airport Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Airports	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage>50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1				
40 Critical Counties	195	30	9	173				
Remaining Counties	734	0	0	734				
Total State	929	30	9	907				

Transportation lifelines, particularly in southern Illinois, are significantly impacted by this NMSZ event. Over 70 bridges are expected to incur complete damage while over 250 experience moderate or more severe damage. Highway road segments connecting these damaged bridges are expected to incur slightly less damage than the bridges themselves, even in these counties with the most severe shaking. Highway segments are most generally defined as a section of highway between two end nodes. These end nodes are frequently highway bridges. At least moderate damage to highway bridges is characterized by moderate shear (diagonal) cracking of columns, spalling of cover concrete and shear keys, abutment movement less than two-inches, extensive cracking to shear keys, bent connection bolts and moderate settlement of the bridge approaches. Many airports, ports and railway facilities in southern Illinois incur moderate damage, greatly impeding the operation of these facilities. At least moderate damage to port facilities includes considerable ground settlement, derailment of port equipment and damage to structural members. For airports, at least moderate damage is defined in the same manner as damage to other building types discussed previously. The lack of functionality of many transportation lifelines in southern Illinois will make the movement of people and supplies difficult in the days immediately following the earthquake.

Transportation System Damage							
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%		
Highway	Segments	4,333	0	0	4,269		
	Bridges	22,854	264	71	22,591		
	Tunnels	0	0	0	0		
Railways	Segments	8,441	0	0	8,441		
	Bridges	1,030	6	0	1,024		
	Tunnels	4	0	0	4		
	Facilities	285	10	0	275		
Bus	Facilities	119	1	0	119		
Light Rail	Segments	900	0	0	899		
	Bridges	38	0	0	38		
	Facilities	401	401	401	0		
Ferry	Facilities	11	11	11	0		
Port	Facilities	514	20	0	497		
Airport	Facilities	929	30	9	907		
	Runways	705	0	0	705		

 Table 97: Transportation System Damage for the State of Illinois

Table 98: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Functionality >50% at Day 1					
40 Critical Counties	74	11	1	63		
Remaining Counties	168	0	0	168		
Total State	242	11	1	231		

Table 99: Damage to Waste Water Facilities

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
Total No. of Potable WaterAt Least ModerateComplete DamageFuFacilities(Damage>50%)(Damage>50%)50							
40 Critical Counties	2,221	461	8	1,246			
Remaining Counties	7,168	0	0	7,168			
Total State	9,389	461	8	8,414			

Utility lifelines are significantly impacted by the NMSZ scenario event with hundreds of facilities moderately or completely damaged. Over 450 waste water facilities are moderately or more severely damaged while 8 incur complete damage. All facilities experiencing complete damage are located in the extreme southern counties in Illinois. Approximately 20% of all natural gas and electric power facilities in the critical counties incur at least moderate damage. Communication facilities are the most prominent utility

inventory type in Illinois and also report the most damage with 1,450 moderately or more severely damaged facilities.

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments							
Total No. of Natural GasAt Least Moderate DamageComplete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functional >50% at Da							
40 Critical Counties	388	79	4	309			
Remaining Counties	945	0	0	945			
Total State	1,333	79	4	1,254			

Table 100: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Table 101: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments						
Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functional >50% at Da						
40 Critical Counties	109	3	0	106		
Remaining Counties	166	0	0	166		
Total State	275	3	0	272		

Table 102: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Functionality >50% at Day 1					
40 Critical Counties	334	59	3	205		
Remaining Counties	1,838	0	0	1,838		
Total State	2,172	59	3	2,043		

Table 103: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Facilities Damage Assessments						
Total No. of CommunicationAt Least ModerateComplete DamageFun >50%Facilities(Damage>50%)(Damage>50%)						
40 Critical Counties	7,464	1,450	66	6,577		
Remaining Counties	27,369	0	0	27,369		
Total State	34,833	1,450	66	33,946		

Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable water, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not included in the HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory, called local inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional oil pipelines are added to provide damage estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are composed of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks

are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at roughly 5,500 and 5,400, respectively. Local natural gas lines, however; show the greatest break and leak rates per length of pipe at roughly 0.070 leaks/mile (1 leak every 14.3 miles) or 0.069 breaks/mile (roughly 1 break every 14.5 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of 4,666 leaks and 4,572 breaks over the combined length of 80,969 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off for over 70,700 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This is reduced to roughly 43,000 residences within a week and no customers will be without service after three months. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. Additional information on this formula is available in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual that accompanies the program. This period of time without water prevents thousands of people from remaining in their homes in the weeks and months following the earthquake. Electric power service shows similar trends, with over 69,600 residential service outages the day after the earthquake, or nearly 1.5% of all state residences without power. Even a month after the earthquake nearly 6,700 residences are still without power. All electric power lines in Illinois are presumed to be above ground and less likely to incur damage from moderate ground shaking unlike buried pipelines that are vulnerable to damage from liquefaction and ground deformation.

Pipeline Damage						
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks			
Potable Water - Local	164,911	5,448	5,401			
Waste Water - Local	98,946	4,340	4,272			
Natural Gas - Local	65,964	4,640	4,566			
Natural Gas - Regional	15,005	26	6			
Oil - Regional	8,379	17	4			

 Table 105: Utility Service Interruptions for Critical Counties

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service							
No. Households Day 1 Day 3 Day 7 Day 30 Day 9							
Potable Water	4 504 770	70,781	56,532	43,091	26,770	0	
Electric Power	4,591,779	69,641	48,139	24,340	6,678	83	

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage

state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county. The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (4) and employed in the preceding damage tables for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Jackson County, Illinois 194 waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 4:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 194 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of 144 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

In the case of Jackson County, Illinois, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a lower estimate of damage as opposed to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (4). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Illinois are estimated to incur greater damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities for the 40 critical counties in Illinois shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 642 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 461 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces less damage. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix for the NMSZ scenario in the State of Illinois.
The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Illinois. There tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage levels for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Alexander						
Single Family	1	56	530	680	1,191	2458
Other Residential	0	2	17	40	764	823
Commercial	0	0	0	1	7	8
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	1	7	8
Bond						
Single Family	4,250	44	4	0	0	4298
Other Residential	1,095	117	15	0	0	1227
Commercial	23	1	0	0	0	24
Industrial	4	0	0	0	0	4
Other	6	0	0	0	0	6
Calhoun						
Single Family	1,804	19	1	0	0	1824
Other Residential	359	40	5	0	0	404
Commercial	19	0	0	0	0	19
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	5	0	0	0	0	5
Clark						
Single Family	5,158	54	4	0	0	5216
Other Residential	896	93	12	0	0	1001
Commercial	26	1	0	0	0	27
Industrial	17	0	0	0	0	17
Other	7	0	0	0	0	7
Clay						
Single Family	3,577	361	65	3	0	4006
Other Residential	718	268	134	3	0	1123
Commercial	25	6	3	0	0	34
Industrial	12	6	3	0	0	21
Other	12	1	0	0	0	13
Clinton						
Single Family	8,681	267	41	2	259	9250
Other Residential	1,419	298	118	3	102	1940
Commercial	58	8	3	0	3	72
Industrial	14	1	0	0	1	16
Other	11	1	0	0	0	12
Crawford						
Single Family	5,978	62	5	0	0	6045
Other Residential	746	78	10	0	0	834
Commercial	42	1	0	0	0	43
Industrial	5	0	0	0	0	5
Other	5	0	0	0	0	5

Table 100: Building Damage by General Occupanc	uilding Damage by General Occup	oancy
--	---------------------------------	-------

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Edwards						
Single Family	1,744	186	34	2	0	1966
Other Residential	388	174	91	2	0	655
Commercial	8	3	1	0	0	12
Industrial	14	3	2	0	0	19
Other	4	1	0	0	0	5
Effingham						
Single Family	9,289	97	8	0	0	9394
Other Residential	1,176	115	14	0	0	1305
Commercial	178	5	1	0	0	184
Industrial	60	2	0	0	0	62
Other	27	1	0	0	0	28
Fayette						
Single Family	5,541	58	5	0	0	5604
Other Residential	1,596	175	22	0	0	1793
Commercial	48	1	0	0	0	49
Industrial	3	0	0	0	0	3
Other	20	1	0	0	0	21
Franklin						
Single Family	9,670	1,634	302	17	123	11746
Other Residential	959	756	438	11	20	2184
Commercial	41	18	7	1	1	68
Industrial	6	3	2	0	0	11
Other	7	3	1	0	0	11
Gallatin						
Single Family	1,438	243	45	3	8	1737
Other Residential	294	263	156	4	2	719
Commercial	2	1	0	0	0	3
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0	0	0	1
Greene						
Single Family	4,273	45	4	0	0	4322
Other Residential	676	69	9	0	0	754
Commercial	22	1	0	0	0	23
Industrial	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	14	0	0	0	0	14
Hamilton						
Single Family	1,976	334	62	6	21	2399
Other Residential	290	257	152	5	6	710
Commercial	9	4	1	0	0	14
Industrial	1	0	0	0	0	1
Other	8	3	1	0	0	12

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Hardin						
Single Family	1,178	199	37	2	0	1416
Other Residential	205	178	105	3	0	491
Commercial	1	1	0	0	0	2
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0	0	0	1
Jackson						
Single Family	8,652	1,967	349	20	975	11963
Other Residential	2,520	1,820	1,012	27	333	5712
Commercial	97	43	18	1	8	167
Industrial	4	2	1	0	0	7
Other	23	9	4	0	2	38
Jasper						
Single Family	2,901	30	2	0	0	2933
Other Residential	481	52	6	0	0	539
Commercial	10	0	0	0	0	10
Industrial	4	0	0	0	0	4
Other	5	0	0	0	0	5
Jefferson						
Single Family	8,275	1,398	259	18	42	9992
Other Residential	1,353	1,122	655	18	16	3164
Commercial	91	38	16	1	1	147
Industrial	15	7	3	0	0	25
Other	12	4	2	0	0	18
Jersey					_	
Single Family	6,203	65	5	0	0	6273
Other Residential	894	89	11	0	0	994
Commercial	34	1	0	0	0	35
Industrial	5	0	0	0	0	5
Other	16	0	0	0	0	16
Johnson	1.54	007	1 005	202	105	20.42
Single Family	164	887	1,225	382	185	2843
Other Residential	8	74	396	576	324	1378
Commercial	0	0	3	6	7	16
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	1	3	3	1
	2 421	67 0	107	~	201	4210
Single Family	3,421	578	107	5	201	4512
Other Residential	444	382	225	6	30	1087
	22	9	4	U	3	58
Industrial	4	2	1	U	1	8 12
Other	/	5	1	U	1	12

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Macoupin						
Single Family Other Residential	14,351 2.088	150 214	12 27	0	0	14513 2329
Commercial	121	3	0	0	0	124
Industrial	10	0	0	0	0	124
Other	31	1	0	0	0	32
Madison	51	1	0	0	0	52
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial	68,175 5,945 595 37	2,994 1,014 61 2	494 420 21 1	24 10 1 0	2,083 322 15 1	73770 7711 693 41
Other	77	7	2	0	1	87
Marion						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	10,367 2,200 66 18 6	738 570 14 2	129 248 5 1	6 6 0 0	0 0 0 0	11240 3024 85 21 7
Massac	0	1	0	0	0	7
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	48 1 0 0 0	745 16 0 0 0	1,633 175 4 0 1	530 418 9 1 2	1,176 774 18 3 4	4132 1384 31 4 7
Monroe						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	6,985 335 64 2 3	871 153 14 0 1	154 82 5 0 0	11 2 0 0 0	24 2 0 0 0	8045 574 83 2 4
Montgomery	9,400	00	7	0	0	0505
Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	8,490 1,014 70 2 10	88 104 2 0 0	13 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	8585 1131 72 2 10
Perry	-	-	-	-	•	-
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial	4,884 668 29 4	825 520 12 2	153 301 5 1	10 8 0 0	59 28 1 0	5931 1525 47 7
Other	16	6	2	0	0	24

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Роре						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial	712 110 0	375 125 1	212 157 2	50 112 1	10 19 0	1359 523 4
Industrial Other	0	0	0	0	0	0 2
Pulaski			_	_	-	
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	1 0 0 0 0	71 1 0 0 0	649 31 0 0 0	468 142 2 0 1	616 633 11 1 9	1805 807 13 1 10
Randolph						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	6,737 891 42 5 19	1,139 736 18 2 7	211 430 7 1 3	16 12 1 0 0	473 89 6 0 1	8576 2158 74 8 30
Richland						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	4,992 753 40 5 4	52 77 1 0 0	4 10 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	5048 840 41 5 4
Saint Clair						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other Saline	52,947 5,979 381 14 76	8,358 2,869 139 3 24	1,518 1,501 56 1 9	97 42 4 0 1	2,390 410 14 2 3	65310 10801 594 20 113
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	6,524 733 42 1 6	1,102 646 18 1 2	204 381 7 0 1	14 10 1 0 0	30 7 1 0 0	7874 1777 69 2 9
Union						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial	19 0 0 0	390 9 0 0	1,780 127 1 0	1,410 338 6 0	1,137 1,003 35 1	4736 1477 42 1
Other	0	0	1	1	4	6

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Wabash						
Single Family	2,913	492	91	5	102	3603
Other Residential	366	301	176	4	12	859
Commercial	16	7	3	0	2	28
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	4	1	1	0	0	6
Washington						
Single Family	3,898	659	122	8	12	4699
Other Residential	271	246	146	4	2	669
Commercial	25	11	4	0	0	40
Industrial	1	1	0	0	0	2
Other	5	2	1	0	0	8
Wayne						
Single Family	4,568	157	25	1	0	4751
Other Residential	1,429	298	112	2	0	1841
Commercial	46	3	1	0	0	50
Industrial	9	1	0	0	0	10
Other	11	1	0	0	0	12
White						
Single Family	3,546	854	152	12	32	4596
Other Residential	487	425	251	7	7	1177
Commercial	19	9	4	0	0	32
Industrial	1	1	0	0	0	2
Other	3	1	0	0	0	4
Williamson						
Single Family	12,946	2,809	502	27	437	16721
Other Residential	1,789	1,304	727	19	182	4021
Commercial	115	51	21	2	5	194
Industrial	6	3	2	0	0	11
Other	16	6	3	0	1	26

	Te4e1 #	Da	y 1	D	ay 3	Da	y 7	Day	7 30	Day	7 90
Counties	of Beds	# of	0/_	# of	0/_						
	or Deas	Beds	/0	Beds	/0	Beds	/0	Beds	/0	Beds	/0
Alexander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bond	189	182	96.40	182	96.50	188	99.30	189	99.90	189	99.90
Calhoun	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Clark	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Clay	22	10	47.70	11	48.30	16	73.60	21	97.60	22	98.80
Clinton	197	142	72.05	143	72.40	170	86.45	195	98.75	196	99.35
Crawford	93	90	96.40	90	96.50	92	99.30	93	99.90	93	99.90
Edwards	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Effingham	146	141	96.40	141	96.50	145	99.30	146	99.90	146	99.90
Fayette	48	46	96.40	46	96.50	48	99.30	48	99.90	48	99.90
Franklin	158	75	47.20	76	47.80	115	72.90	153	96.60	155	97.80
Gallatin	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Greene	73	70	96.40	70	96.50	72	99.30	73	99.90	73	99.90
Hamilton	101	48	47.20	48	47.80	74	72.90	98	96.60	99	97.80
Hardin	48	17	35.80	17	36.20	26	55.20	35	73.20	36	74.10
Jackson	209	94	45.00	95	45.50	146	69.70	194	92.70	196	93.80
Jasper	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jefferson	207	98	47.45	99	48.05	152	73.25	201	97.10	203	98.30
Jersey	67	65	96.40	65	96.50	67	99.30	67	99.90	67	99.90
Johnson	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lawrence	58	28	47.70	28	48.30	43	73.60	57	97.60	57	98.80
Macoupin	82	79	96.40	79	96.50	81	99.30	82	99.90	82	99.90
Madison	1,294	1,122	86.70	1,124	86.87	1,208	93.37	1,266	97.87	1,269	98.07
Marion	322	232	72.05	233	72.40	278	86.45	318	98.75	320	99.35
Massac	57	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.00	8	13.80
Monroe	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Montgomery	197	190	96.40	190	96.50	196	99.30	197	99.90	197	99.90
Perry	125	59	47.45	60	48.05	92	73.25	121	97.10	123	98.30
Pope	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pulaski	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Randolph	542	257	47.45	260	48.05	397	73.25	526	97.10	533	98.30
Richland	122	118	96.40	118	96.50	121	99.30	122	99.90	122	99.90
Saint Clair	1,153	571	49.54	577	50.04	826	71.68	1,061	91.98	1,072	92.98
Saline	131	62	47.45	63	48.05	96	73.25	127	97.10	129	98.30
Union	508	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	68	13.40	218	42.90
Wabash	56	27	47.70	27	48.30	41	73.60	55	97.60	55	98.80
Washington	61	29	47.70	29	48.30	45	73.60	60	97.60	60	98.80
Wayne	185	178	96.40	179	96.50	184	99.30	185	99.90	185	99.90
White	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Williamson	363	172	47.30	174	47.90	266	73.30	354	97.60	359	98.80

Table 107: Hospital Functionality

* Note: Discrepancies between the number of hospital beds and the percentage of beds may occur due to rounding.

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Alexander	112	25.25	36.96	46.58	73.81	95.33
Bond	97	98.98	99.78	99.84	99.90	99.90
Calhoun	41	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Clark	156	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Clay	111	93.62	98.96	99.43	99.90	99.90
Clinton	254	93.17	98.87	99.37	99.87	99.89
Crawford	174	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Edwards	77	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Effingham	237	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Fayette	168	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Franklin	194	74.10	91.38	94.15	99.02	99.80
Gallatin	59	77.02	92.29	94.39	98.18	99.64
Greene	95	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Hamilton	91	78.40	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Hardin	30	77.83	93.29	95.39	98.95	99.79
Jackson	338	49.06	70.46	77.57	93.32	98.75
Jasper	97	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Jefferson	237	85.28	96.27	97.63	99.69	99.90
Jersey	78	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Johnson	125	35.90	55.36	65.39	89.22	98.01
Lawrence	109	93.14	98.84	99.34	99.85	99.89
Macoupin	285	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Madison	781	95.65	99.14	99.45	99.77	99.87
Marion	239	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Massac	128	39.88	60.05	68.70	89.12	98.03
Monroe	129	88.08	97.04	98.08	99.59	99.87
Montgomery	240	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Perry	155	78.34	93.93	96.03	99.45	99.89
Pope	105	64.84	85.76	90.03	98.05	99.60
Pulaski	85	26.00	38.62	48.64	76.06	95.72
Randolph	248	78.90	93.63	95.61	98.96	99.79
Richland	118	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Saint Clair	811	89.50	97.54	98.41	99.64	99.87
Saline	167	77.20	93.27	95.58	99.41	99.88
Union	177	23.81	34.65	44.87	73.65	95.27
Wabash	104	93.15	98.85	99.35	99.86	99.89
Washington	161	89.80	97.77	98.64	99.81	99.90
Wayne	161	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
White	187	78.24	93.80	95.90	99.35	99.87
Williamson	303	53.12	75.23	81.85	95.84	99.18

 Table 108: Communication Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Alexander	2	0.00
Bond	3	94.10
Calhoun	2	94.10
Clark	5	94.10
Clay	2	73.00
Clinton	8	84.83
Crawford	5	94.10
Edwards	3	65.97
Effingham	5	94.10
Fayette	6	94.10
Franklin	7	71.53
Gallatin	6	68.82
Greene	5	94.10
Hamilton	1	71.30
Hardin	3	66.07
Jackson	6	66.00
Jasper	2	94.10
Jefferson	2	71.30
Jersey	4	94.10
Johnson	1	0.00
Lawrence	5	51.90
Macoupin	14	94.10
Madison	39	80.69
Marion	6	95.80
Massac	8	0.00
Monroe	6	50.13
Montgomery	11	94.10
Perry	7	51.76
Роре	4	39.13
Pulaski	6	0.00
Randolph	9	50.18
Richland	2	94.10
Saint Clair	36	58.30
Saline	4	56.18
Union	3	0.00
Wabash	2	51.90
Washington	11	52.31
Wayne	4	84.73
White	7	46.71
Williamson	5	61.26

Table 109: Police Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Alexander	15	0.00
Bond	8	94.10
Calhoun	7	94.10
Clark	9	94.10
Clay	11	59.57
Clinton	26	80.03
Crawford	12	94.10
Edwards	3	65.97
Effingham	25	94.10
Fayette	13	94.10
Franklin	28	71.64
Gallatin	1	71.30
Greene	9	94.10
Hamilton	6	71.30
Hardin	5	68.48
Jackson	80	67.40
Jasper	7	94.10
Jefferson	19	59.89
Jersey	11	94.10
Johnson	8	0.20
Lawrence	8	51.05
Macoupin	32	94.10
Madison	320	87.98
Marion	30	79.18
Massac	33	0.00
Monroe	25	53.94
Montgomery	20	94.10
Perry	15	51.77
Роре	31	42.01
Pulaski	9	0.00
Randolph	22	49.85
Richland	7	94.10
Saint Clair	212	58.26
Saline	17	46.42
Union	12	0.00
Wabash	8	51.90
Washington	22	46.63
Wayne	13	81.02
White	12	46.70
Williamson	16	67.06

Table 110: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Alexander	7	0.00
Bond	8	94.10
Calhoun	5	94.10
Clark	4	94.10
Clay	5	68.78
Clinton	6	84.68
Crawford	5	94.10
Edwards	4	73.00
Effingham	11	94.10
Fayette	6	94.10
Franklin	14	71.69
Gallatin	6	62.78
Greene	8	94.10
Hamilton	3	71.30
Hardin	3	66.07
Jackson	12	67.23
Jasper	3	94.10
Jefferson	12	61.30
Jersey	4	94.10
Johnson	6	0.13
Lawrence	5	50.54
Macoupin	16	94.10
Madison	64	78.96
Marion	4	81.63
Massac	7	0.00
Monroe	7	62.74
Montgomery	12	94.10
Perry	7	51.83
Роре	4	26.35
Pulaski	8	0.00
Randolph	6	51.57
Richland	5	94.10
Saint Clair	43	55.92
Saline	4	30.23
Union	8	0.00
Wabash	5	51.90
Washington	7	36.56
Wayne	6	82.03
White	6	46.73
Williamson	10	57.59

Table 111: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Alexander	3,808	94.40	82.80	59.60	21.90	0.10
Bond	6,155	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	2,046	0	0	0	0	0
Clark	6,971	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	5,839	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	12,754	0	0	0	0	0
Crawford	7,842	0	0	0	0	0
Edwards	2,905	0	0	0	0	0
Effingham	13,001	0	0	0	0	0
Fayette	8,146	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	16,408	29.20	14.90	4.10	0.50	0
Gallatin	2,726	0	0	0	0	0
Greene	5,757	0	0	0	0	0
Hamilton	3,462	0	0	0	0	0
Hardin	1,987	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	24,215	83.10	55.50	25.10	5.70	0.10
Jasper	3,930	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	15,374	0	0	0	0	0
Jersey	8,096	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson	4,183	89.70	67.80	35.50	8.20	0.10
Lawrence	6,309	0	0	0	0	0
Macoupin	19,253	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	101,953	0	0	0	0	0
Marion	16,619	0	0	0	0	0
Massac	6,261	86.90	63.70	35.40	11.30	0.10
Monroe	10,275	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	11,507	0	0	0	0	0
Perry	8,504	0	0	0	0	0
Pope	1,769	70.40	35.80	9.80	1.20	0.10
Pulaski	2,893	94.30	82.00	57.50	20.30	0.10
Randolph	12,084	0	0	0	0	0
Richland	6,660	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Clair	96,810	0	0	0	0	0
Saline	10,992	7.60	3.90	1.10	0.10	0
Union	7,290	95.20	85.70	63.40	23.20	0.10
Wabash	5,192	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	5,848	0	0	0	0	0
Wayne	7,143	0	0	0	0	0
White	6,534	0	0	0	0	0
Williamson	25,358	79.70	49.70	19.90	4.00	0.10

Table 112: Households without Electric Power Service

Germfler	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Counties	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Alexander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bond	1	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Calhoun	3	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Clark	3	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Clay	1	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Clinton	2	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Crawford	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Edwards	1	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Effingham	3	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Fayette	2	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Franklin	1	19.73	42.20	30.82	6.56	0.67
Gallatin	3	19.27	41.22	30.11	6.41	2.98
Greene	4	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Hamilton	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hardin	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jackson	2	2.45	17.06	38.32	26.39	15.76
Jasper	1	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Jefferson	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jersey	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Johnson	3	0.74	8.99	33.30	36.82	20.13
Lawrence	2	49.81	37.45	11.31	0.98	0.45
Macoupin	4	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Madison	8	61.46	28.85	8.51	0.73	0.43
Marion	2	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Massac	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Monroe	1	18.35	39.26	28.68	6.10	7.59
Montgomery	4	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Perry	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pope	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pulaski	1	0.16	3.24	19.73	36.47	40.38
Randolph	4	19.39	41.47	30.29	6.45	2.40
Richland	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Saint Clair	6	39.78	39.03	17.81	2.84	0.52
Saline	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Union	2	0.03	0.69	8.94	37.31	53.02
Wabash	1	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Washington	2	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Wayne	3	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
White	1	19.73	42.20	30.82	6.56	0.67
Williamson	3	1.74	13.81	37.89	34.13	12.40

Table 113: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Alexander	3,808	99.7	99.7	99.5	83.6	0
Bond	6,155	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	2,046	0	0	0	0	0
Clark	6,971	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	5,839	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	12,754	11	0.8	0	0	0
Crawford	7,842	0	0	0	0	0
Edwards	2,905	0	0	0	0	0
Effingham	13,001	0	0	0	0	0
Fayette	8,146	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	16,408	0	0	0	0	0
Gallatin	2,726	0	0	0	0	0
Greene	5,757	0	0	0	0	0
Hamilton	3,462	0	0	0	0	0
Hardin	1,987	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	24,215	96.9	96.6	95.8	82.5	0
Jasper	3,930	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	15,374	0	0	0	0	0
Jersey	8,096	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson	4,183	4.6	0	0	0	0
Lawrence	6,309	0	0	0	0	0
Macoupin	19,253	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	101,953	2.9	0.3	0	0	0
Marion	16,619	0	0	0	0	0
Massac	6,261	99.5	99.4	99	57.6	0
Monroe	10,275	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	11,507	0	0	0	0	0
Perry	8,504	0	0	0	0	0
Pope	1,769	0	0	0	0	0
Pulaski	2,893	99.4	99.3	98.8	0	0
Randolph	12,084	31.2	16.3	0	0	0
Richland	6,660	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Clair	96,810	7.8	2.7	0	0	0
Saline	10,992	0	0	0	0	0
Union	7,290	85.3	80.9	66	0	0
Wabash	5,192	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	5,848	0	0	0	0	0
Wayne	7,143	0	0	0	0	0
White	6,534	0	0	0	0	0
Williamson	25,358	48.6	36.9	8.8	0	0

Table 114: Households without Potable Water Service

Counting	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Counties	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Alexander	22	0.12	2.39	16.28	37.72	43.46
Bond	24	81.09	14.67	3.88	0.33	0.02
Calhoun	5	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Clark	34	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Clay	20	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Clinton	77	49.96	37.56	11.34	0.98	0.13
Crawford	31	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Edwards	16	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Effingham	67	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Fayette	29	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Franklin	59	15.57	38.71	34.52	9.63	1.55
Gallatin	67	19.58	41.89	30.59	6.51	1.40
Greene	30	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Hamilton	7	19.73	42.20	30.82	6.56	0.67
Hardin	27	19.42	41.55	30.34	6.46	2.21
Jackson	194	4.46	21.53	38.52	24.77	10.70
Jasper	20	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Jefferson	58	28.08	40.93	25.45	5.02	0.50
Jersey	27	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Johnson	23	0.65	8.31	32.94	39.67	18.41
Lawrence	35	49.83	37.47	11.31	0.98	0.39
Macoupin	79	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Madison	273	74.83	19.13	5.34	0.45	0.23
Marion	67	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Massac	31	1.14	11.00	34.84	34.60	18.40
Monroe	43	33.67	39.82	21.60	3.93	0.96
Montgomery	87	96.63	3.21	0.15	0.00	0.00
Perry	73	19.73	42.20	30.82	6.56	0.68
Pope	14	8.63	33.09	41.05	14.92	2.29
Pulaski	26	0.15	3.11	19.94	39.66	37.13
Randolph	70	21.48	40.99	28.79	6.02	2.70
Richland	18	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
Saint Clair	243	42.48	38.55	16.01	2.32	0.61
Saline	84	19.73	42.20	30.82	6.56	0.68
Union	25	0.05	1.40	12.99	39.83	45.71
Wabash	22	49.95	37.55	11.34	0.98	0.17
Washington	43	45.07	38.34	14.52	1.89	0.16
Wayne	24	50.00	37.59	11.35	0.98	0.06
White	23	19.67	42.07	30.73	6.54	0.97
Williamson	104	4.91	23.32	40.15	24.13	7.47

 Table 115: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Alexander	01	13 75	674	7.48	16 78	(70) 55.22
Rond	150	08 53	0.74	0.27	0.23	0.03
Calhoun	58	00.18	0.92	0.27	0.23	0.03
Clark	180	99.10 00.28	0.40	0.21	0.12	0.02
Clark Clay	150	99.20	0.47	0.14	0.09	0.01
Clay	132	90.72 07.27	0.83	0.20	0.15	0.02
Clinton	173	97.27	0.79	0.23	1.51	0.10
Crawioru Edmonda	170	99.51	0.43	0.15	0.08	0.01
Euwarus Effin ah am	80 217	98.75	0.82	0.23	0.14	0.02
Ellingnam	217	98.02	0.90	0.28	0.16	0.02
Fayette	320	98.87	0.69	0.25	0.15	0.02
Franklin	238	95.63	0.81	0.17	0.53	2.84
Gallatin	/1	88.63	1.09	0.21	0.16	9.88
Greene	140	98.25	1.11	0.39	0.21	0.03
Hamilton	167	98.54	0.95	0.18	0.24	0.05
Hardin	44	96.01	2.08	0.42	0.30	1.17
Jackson	177	82.61	4.22	0.28	0.59	12.28
Jasper	151	98.25	1.15	0.37	0.19	0.02
Jefferson	213	97.49	1.12	0.24	0.27	0.86
Jersey	90	97.35	1.65	0.62	0.32	0.04
Johnson	103	68.28	8.69	5.32	9.54	8.15
Lawrence	148	92.09	1.74	0.41	4.38	1.36
Macoupin	206	98.21	1.19	0.37	0.19	0.02
Madison	396	94.79	1.10	0.36	3.18	0.54
Marion	247	98.30	1.14	0.34	0.18	0.02
Massac	118	63.62	6.39	4.34	7.87	17.75
Monroe	102	87.44	3.78	0.28	3.03	5.45
Montgomery	212	97.90	1.31	0.49	0.26	0.04
Perry	124	91.66	1.60	0.36	0.43	5.93
Pope	71	85.89	3.99	2.03	2.25	5.82
Pulaski	93	34.52	8.45	7.53	14.99	34.49
Randolph	136	87.70	1.73	0.36	0.58	9.61
Richland	131	98.68	0.89	0.26	0.14	0.02
Saint Clair	383	92.11	1.25	0.31	4.83	1.48
Saline	164	97.65	1.54	0.34	0.41	0.05
Union	178	47.38	10.27	8.12	14.32	19.89
Wabash	76	97.48	0.70	0.32	1.42	0.06
Washington	202	98.34	0.83	0.19	0.53	0.10
Wayne	234	98.42	1.04	0.32	0.18	0.02
White	197	92.45	3.45	0.31	0.31	3.45
Williamson	149	90.53	2.47	0.24	0.85	5.88

Table 116: Highway Bridge Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Alexander	91	22.60	26.54	29.64	32.22	44.26
Bond	150	99.25	99.56	99.66	99.69	99.80
Calhoun	58	99.53	99.69	99.78	99.79	99.85
Clark	180	99.62	99.77	99.83	99.84	99.87
Clay	152	99.37	99.65	99.75	99.77	99.84
Clinton	175	97.95	98.22	98.33	98.47	99.22
Crawford	170	99.63	99.78	99.83	99.84	99.87
Edwards	80	99.39	99.66	99.76	99.78	99.84
Effingham	217	99.33	99.63	99.74	99.76	99.84
Fayette	320	99.41	99.65	99.75	99.77	99.84
Franklin	238	96.31	96.55	96.63	96.73	97.18
Gallatin	71	89.66	89.99	90.10	90.26	91.00
Greene	140	99.15	99.53	99.68	99.71	99.81
Hamilton	167	99.27	99.56	99.63	99.67	99.78
Hardin	44	97.67	98.31	98.48	98.53	98.76
Jackson	177	86.05	87.19	87.34	87.56	88.69
Jasper	151	99.17	99.56	99.70	99.73	99.82
Jefferson	213	98.37	98.72	98.82	98.87	99.06
Jersey	90	98.72	99.31	99.55	99.60	99.75
Johnson	103	76.78	80.54	82.66	83.87	89.16
Lawrence	148	93.66	94.21	94.43	94.84	97.11
Macoupin	206	99.16	99.56	99.70	99.73	99.82
Madison	396	95.80	96.20	96.37	96.67	98.28
Marion	247	99.20	99.58	99.71	99.74	99.82
Massac	118	70.26	73.12	74.89	76.03	81.15
Monroe	102	90.52	91.56	91.72	92.07	93.94
Montgomery	212	98.97	99.43	99.62	99.66	99.79
Perry	124	93.04	93.54	93.70	93.83	94.44
Pope	71	89.60	91.20	92.01	92.38	93.88
Pulaski	93	44.20	48.56	51.62	53.77	63.54
Randolph	136	89.25	89.80	89.97	90.16	91.09
Richland	131	99.36	99.66	99.76	99.78	99.84
Saint Clair	383	93.30	93.72	93.89	94.35	96.85
Saline	164	98.87	99.34	99.48	99.53	99.73
Union	178	58.29	63.27	66.51	68.45	76.89
Wabash	76	98.09	98.36	98.49	98.63	99.34
Washington	202	98.98	99.24	99.32	99.37	99.63
Wayne	234	99.25	99.59	99.72	99.74	99.83
White	197	95.14	96.11	96.23	96.33	96.71
Williamson	149	92.56	93.25	93.36	93.53	94.34

Table 117: Highway Bridge Functionality

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Alexander	539	1,457	949
Bond	979	5	1
Calhoun	524	3	1
Clark	1,305	7	2
Clay	1,300	7	2
Clinton	1,384	33	104
Crawford	1,303	7	2
Edwards	587	3	1
Effingham	1,444	8	2
Fayette	2,004	11	3
Franklin	1,332	11	17
Gallatin	656	4	4
Greene	1,088	6	1
Hamilton	1,026	8	12
Hardin	372	2	1
Jackson	1,677	394	1,348
Jasper	1,291	7	2
Jefferson	1,685	11	11
Jersey	873	5	1
Johnson	725	211	53
Lawrence	1,162	12	22
Macoupin	2,193	12	3
Madison	2,998	46	121
Marion	1,743	10	2
Massac	588	454	861
Monroe	827	6	6
Montgomery	1,813	10	2
Perry	1,062	9	16
Pope	546	30	7
Pulaski	463	685	681
Randolph	1,381	50	172
Richland	1,060	6	1
Saint Clair	2,949	57	167
Saline	1,025	7	5
Union	912	1,122	384
Wabash	603	5	7
Washington	1,262	8	7
Wayne	1,893	10	3
White	1,461	10	12
Williamson	1,426	107	248

 Table 118: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Alexander	323	1,153	751
Bond	587	4	1
Calhoun	315	2	1
Clark	783	6	1
Clay	780	6	1
Clinton	830	26	82
Crawford	782	6	1
Edwards	352	3	1
Effingham	867	6	2
Fayette	1,202	9	2
Franklin	799	9	13
Gallatin	394	4	4
Greene	653	5	1
Hamilton	616	6	9
Hardin	223	2	0
Jackson	1,006	312	1,066
Jasper	774	6	1
Jefferson	1,011	9	9
Jersey	524	4	1
Johnson	435	167	42
Lawrence	697	9	18
Macoupin	1,316	9	2
Madison	1,799	36	96
Marion	1,046	8	2
Massac	353	359	681
Monroe	496	4	5
Montgomery	1,088	8	2
Perry	637	7	13
Pope	328	24	6
Pulaski	278	542	538
Randolph	829	40	136
Richland	636	5	1
Saint Clair	1,769	45	132
Saline	615	5	4
Union	547	888	303
Wabash	362	4	6
Washington	757	6	5
Wayne	1,136	8	2
White	877	8	9
Williamson	855	85	196

Table 119: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Indiana – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 92 counties in the State of Indiana. Indiana is approximately 36,100 square miles and is bordered by Michigan to the north, Kentucky to the south, Ohio to the east, and Illinois to the west. For the purposes of this analysis, 11 critical counties have been identified in the southwestern portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 11 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document. The critical counties are listed below:

• Daviess

• Knox

• Dubois

• Pike

- Gibson
- Greene

- Posey
- Spencer

- Sullivan
- Vanderburgh
- Warrick

Please note critical counties for Indiana are the same for both scenarios. Both hazards are located in the southwestern portion of the state and thus the same set of critical counties is sufficient for both Indiana scenarios.

The NMSZ scenario for the State of Indiana consists of a magnitude 7.7 (M_w 7.7) earthquake along one segment of the New Madrid Fault. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for the middle fault in the proposed New Madrid Seismic Zone. Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northeastern, central, and southwestern. This scenario, the worst case event for Indiana, employs an event in the northeast segment of the eastern fault. For more information on the ground motion used in this scenario please reference Appendix I.

The $M_w7.7$ event in the NMSZ does not generate catastrophic damage as it does in other central U.S. states. Shaking is less intense even in southwestern Indiana which is closest to the fault. Complete damage to buildings is extremely limited, though moderate damage is likely in southwestern counties such as Posey, Gibson and Vanderburgh. Most damaged structures are residential and either single family homes or other residential buildings which are often multi-resident buildings. Approximately 93% of all damage occurs in these two types of residential structures. The critical counties in southwestern Indiana experience just over half of all building damage. This indicates that damage occurs in locations with minor shaking though soft soils in outlying areas may contribute to the extent of moderate damage outside the 11 critical counties.



Figure 5: Location of Fault Rupture for Indiana NMSZ Scenario

Table 120: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Indiana	
	_

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)							
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage				
Single Family	1,675,434	2,814	2				
Other Residential	229,169	3,189	0				
Commercial	19,034	154	0				
Industrial	4,317	37	0				
Other	4,102	266	0				
Total	1,932,056	6,460	2				

Table 121: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 11 Critical Counties

General Occupancy Type Damage (11 Critical Counties)							
General Occupancy Type	/ Total No. Moderate to Buildings Severe Damage		Complete Damage				
Single Family	133,792	1,652	2				
Other Residential	21,966	1,386	0				
Commercial	1,410	100	0				
Industrial	279	21	0				
Other	1,967	261	0				
Total	159,414	3,420	2				

Building Damage by Building Type							
Building Type	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete		
Wood	1,388,618	7,908	150	0	0		
Steel	8,288	463	191	13	0		
Concrete	2,618	126	39	1	0		
Precast	2,862	158	90	7	0		
Reinforced Masonry	1,737	35	14	1	0		
Unreinforced Masonry	337,716	18,051	2,823	109	2		
Mobile Home	140,340	16,674	2,994	28	0		
Total	1,882,179	43,415	6,301	159	2		

Table 122: Building Damage by Building Type for the State of Indiana

Unlike the previous state scenarios, the NMSZ event for Indiana generates relatively little damage to wood frame structures. At the low levels of shaking experienced in southern Indiana the relatively flexibly nature of wood frame construction lets these buildings move with the imposed motion and bend without breaking. More brittle structures, such as unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings are more likely to crack at mortar joints and through the bricks themselves even during minor to moderate shaking. Mobile homes are likely to be shaken partially off of their foundations leading which defines moderate damage for this building type. Over 90% of all moderate and more severe damage is experienced by these URMs and mobile homes, making them some of the most vulnerable construction types in the State of Indiana.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality					
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1	
Hospitals	175	0	0	166	
Schools	2,686	0	0	2,630	
EOCs	51	0	0	50	
Police Stations	474	0	0	468	
Fire Stations	1,210	0	0	1,192	

Table 123: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for Indiana⁵

⁵ For Tables 123-133 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality					
EssentialTotal No.At Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFacility TypeFacilities(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)				Functionality >50% at Day 1	
Hospitals	16	0	0	16	
Schools	223	0	0	223	
EOCs	6	0	0	6	
Police Stations	44	0	0	44	
Fire Stations	146	0	0	146	

Table 124: Essential Facilities	Damage & Functionality	v for the Critical Counties
Tuble 12-1. Essential Facilities	Dumage et l'unenomane	y for the ortheat counters

Damage to essential facilities and transportation lifelines is minimal even in the 11 critical counties. No facilities are estimated in incur moderate or more severe damage. Impacts to infrastructure functionality are limited as well. It is likely that emergency services will not be greatly impacted and will be able to travel through the more affected areas of southern Indiana without many complications since all airports and bridges are estimated to remain operational in the days immediately after the earthquake.

Table 125: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments						
	At Least Total No.At Least ModerateComplete DamageFunctionality >50% at Day 1Of BridgesDamage (Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)Functionality >50% at Day 1					
11 Critical Counties	2,220	0	0	2,220		
Remaining Counties	14,285	0	0	14,285		
Total State	16,505	0	0	16,505		

Table 126: Airport Damage Assessments

Airport Damage Assessments						
	At LeastCompleteTotal No.ModerateDamageOf AirportsDamage(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)					
11 Critical Counties	49	0	0	49		
Remaining Counties	447	0	0	447		
Total State	496	0	0	496		

Transportation System Damage					
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%
Highway	Segments	2,844	0	0	2,844
	Bridges	16,505	0	0	16,505
	Tunnels	0	0	0	0
Railways	Segments	4,988	0	0	4,988
-	Bridges	92	0	0	92
	Tunnels	8	0	0	8
	Facilities	91	0	0	91
Bus	Facilities	46	0	0	46
Light Rail	Segments	15	0	0	15
	Bridges	0	0	0	0
	Facilities	13	13	13	0
Ferry	Facilities	0	0	0	0
Port	Facilities	91	0	0	91
Airport	Facilities	496	0	0	496
	Runways	538	0	0	538

 Table 127: Transportation System Damage for the State of Indiana

Utility lifelines show limited damage in the 11 critical counties and throughout the State of Indiana. Low levels of shaking are not likely to generate moderate damage to facilities and impair functionality immediately after the earthquake. Very minor damage to some of the facilities in the critical counties is more likely though this would amount to minor cracking of structural components and other forms of damage that do not reduce the operational capabilities of these lifelines.

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Potable Water FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage (Damage >50%)Functionalit >50% at Day						
11 Critical Counties	16	0	0	16			
Remaining Counties	80	0	0	80			
Total State	96	0	0	96			

 Table 128: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Table 129:	Damage	to	Waste	Water	Facilities
------------	--------	----	-------	-------	------------

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of WasteAt Least Moderate DamageComplete Damage (Damage >50%)Functional >50% at DWater Facilities(Damage >50%)50%Functional >50% at D						
11 Critical Counties	52	0	0	52			
Remaining Counties	394	0	0	394			
Total State	446	0	0	446			

Table 130: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Natural Gas Facilities	Total No. of Natural Gas FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functionality >50% at Day 1					
11 Critical Counties	7	0	0	7			
Remaining Counties	22	0	0	22			
Total State	29	0	0	29			

Table 131: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functionality >50% at Day 1					
11 Critical Counties	35	0	0	35		
Remaining Counties	135	0	0	135		
Total State	170	0	0	170		

Table 132: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Electric Power Facilities	Total No. of Electric Power FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage (Damage >50%)Functionalit >50% at Day						
11 Critical Counties	97	0	0	97				
Remaining Counties	695	0	0	695				
Total State	792	0	0	792				

Table 133: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
11 Critical Counties	2,490	0	0	2,490		
Remaining Counties	19,189	0	0	19,189		
Total State	21,679	0	0	21,679		

Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable water, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not present in the default inventory, or local inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional, or major transmission, oil pipelines are added from HSIP 2007 data to provide estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are comprised of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at 728 and 753, respectively. Local natural gas lines, however, show the greatest break and leak rates per length of pipe

at roughly 0.014 leaks/mile and breaks/mile (roughly 1 leak/break every 70 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of 650 leaks and 652 breaks over the combined length of 54,746 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off to over 44,100 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This is reduced to 11,100 residences within a week, and all service is restored after one month. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. This period of time without water prevents people from remaining in their homes in the weeks immediately following the earthquake. Electric power lines are presumed to be above ground and less likely to incur damage from moderate ground shaking, unlike buried pipelines that are vulnerable to damage from liquefaction and ground deformation. As a result of the low level of shaking, electric power service is not likely to be interrupted for residences in Indiana, even in the first few days following the earthquake.

Pipeline Damage					
System Total Pipelines (mi) No. Leaks No. Breaks					
Potable Water - Local	111,394	753	728		
Waste Water - Local	66,836	596	576		
Natural Gas - Regional	10,188	13	36		
Natural Gas - Local	44,558	637	616		
Oil - Regional	4,625	17	60		

Table 134: Pipeline Damage

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service						
	No. Households (Critical Counties)	Day 1	Day 3	Day 7	Day 30	Day 90
Potable Water	188 251	44,115	34,798	11,075	0	0
Electric Power	100,201	0	0	0	0	0

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage level available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county. The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (5) and employed in the preceding tables for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they

generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Gibson County, Indiana 293 highway bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 5:
 - Summation of individual bridges after that bridge is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 0 at least moderately damaged highway bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of highway bridges in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of bridges in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the bridges in the county provides an estimate of 18 at least moderately damaged highway bridges

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure in the topic damage tables produces more damage. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Indiana. These tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage level for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Daviess			(,	(
Single Family	7,768	289	43	2	0	8,102
Other Residential	1,040	229	95	2	0	1,366
Commercial	73	4	1	0	0	78
Industrial	9	2	1	0	0	12
Other	16	3	1	0	0	20
Dubois						
Single Family	10,692	101	8	0	0	10,801
Other Residential	1,311	100	12	0	0	1,423
Commercial	127	3	0	0	0	130
Industrial	89	2	0	0	0	91
Other	17	0	0	0	0	17
Gibson						
Single Family	9.132	303	45	2	0	9.482
Other Residential	1.506	264	89	2	0	1.861
Commercial	60	3	1	0	0	64
Industrial	8	0	0	ů 0	0	8
Other	20	1	0	ů 0	0	21
Greene	20	1	0	Ū	Ū	21
Single Family	9.007	85	7	0	0	9 099
Other Residential	3 1 1 3	320	40	Û Û	0	3 473
Commercial	76	520 2	-+0	0	0	78
Industrial	9	0	0	0	0	0
Other	10	1	0	0	0	20
Knox	19	I	0	0	0	20
Single Family	10.946	103	8	0	0	11.057
Other Residential	1 567	105	14	0	0	1 608
Commercial	1,507	2	14	0	0	1,090
Industrial	111	3	0	0	0	114
Other	10	0	0	0	0	10
	20	I	0	0	0	21
rike Single Femily	2 202	251	41	2	0	2 407
Other Pasidential	5,205	231	41	2	0	5,497 1 252
Commorgial	090	243	108	2	0	1,235
	12	4	1	0	0	1/
Industrial	3	1	0	0	0	4
Other	4	I	0	0	0	5
Posey	7 7 1 7	272	40	2	0	0.021
Single Family	7,717	272	40	2	0	8,031
Other Residential	984	166	54	1	0	1,205
	30	1	0	0	0	51
Industrial	9	0	0	0	0	9
Other	10	0	0	0	0	10

Table 136: E	Building I	Damage b	oy General	Occupancy
--------------	------------	----------	------------	-----------

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Spencer						
Single Family	5,809	55	4	0	0	5,868
Other Residential	1,026	101	12	0	0	1,139
Commercial	45	1	0	0	0	46
Industrial	6	0	0	0	0	6
Other	25	1	0	0	0	26
Sullivan						
Single Family	5,673	53	4	0	0	5,730
Other Residential	1,230	125	15	0	0	1,370
Commercial	22	1	0	0	0	23
Industrial	1	0	0	0	0	1
Other	3	0	0	0	0	3
Vanderburgh						
Single Family	39,632	6,258	1,053	53	1	46,997
Other Residential	3,274	1,283	592	17	0	5,166
Commercial	455	192	79	6	0	732
Industrial	60	27	15	1	0	103
Other	1,055	487	240	18	0	1,800
Warrick						
Single Family	12,874	1,913	322	16	0	15,125
Other Residential	1,078	604	323	8	0	2,013
Commercial	61	25	10	1	0	97
Industrial	11	4	2	0	0	18
Other	10	3	1	0	0	14

Table 137: Hospital Functionality	y
-----------------------------------	---

	T-4-14-6	Da	y 1	Da	y 3	Da	y 7	Day	30	Day	90
Counties	Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%						
Daviess	85	82	96.40	82	96.50	84	99.30	85	99.90	85	99.90
Dubois	218	210	96.40	210	96.50	216	99.30	218	99.90	218	99.90
Gibson	109	105	96.40	105	96.50	108	99.30	109	99.90	109	99.90
Greene	75	72	96.40	72	96.50	74	99.30	75	99.90	75	99.90
Knox	260	251	96.40	251	96.50	258	99.30	260	99.90	260	99.90
Pike	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Posey	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spencer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sullivan	35	34	96.40	34	96.50	35	99.30	35	99.90	35	99.90
Vanderburgh	1,319	546	41.40	553	41.90	843	63.90	1117	84.70	1130	85.70
Warrick	0	47	44.55	47	45.10	72	68.75	96	91.15	97	92.25

* Note: Discrepancies between the number of hospital beds and the percentage of beds may occur due to rounding.

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Daviess	3	94.10
Dubois	5	94.10
Gibson	3	80.03
Greene	5	94.10
Knox	3	94.10
Pike	4	73.00
Posey	5	86.60
Spencer	2	94.10
Sullivan	3	94.10
Vanderburgh	7	46.07
Warrick	4	51.90

Table 138: Police Station Functionality

Table 139: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Daviess	21	88.07
Dubois	21	94.10
Gibson	20	84.86
Greene	14	94.10
Knox	18	94.10
Pike	5	85.66
Posey	14	81.82
Spencer	13	93.06
Sullivan	10	94.10
Vanderburgh	66	46.64
Warrick	21	53.41

Table 140: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Daviess	12	87.07
Dubois	14	94.10
Gibson	13	81.12
Greene	14	94.10
Knox	19	94.10
Pike	8	78.28
Posey	10	82.38
Spencer	7	90.53
Sullivan	12	94.10
Vanderburgh	26	46.82
Warrick	11	63.41

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	167	99.70	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Dubois	274	99.70	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Gibson	235	93.08	98.78	99.28	99.80	99.88
Greene	155	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Knox	301	99.70	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Pike	127	93.11	98.81	99.31	99.83	99.89
Posey	200	92.99	98.69	99.19	99.73	99.87
Spencer	127	96.74	99.37	99.59	99.83	99.89
Sullivan	184	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Vanderburgh	507	91.47	97.91	98.55	99.42	99.81
Warrick	213	93.09	98.79	99.29	99.81	99.88

Table 141: Communication Functionality

Table 142: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	10,894	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dubois	14,813	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gibson	12,847	57.89	49.02	25.39	0.00	0.00
Greene	13,372	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Knox	15,552	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pike	5,119	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Posey	10,205	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spencer	7,569	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sullivan	7,819	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vanderburgh	70,623	51.93	40.36	11.06	0.00	0.00
Warrick	19,438	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 143: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Daviess	2	93.7%	6.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Dubois	3	93.7%	6.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Gibson	1	49.6%	37.3%	11.3%	1.0%	0.8%
Greene	1	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Knox	1	93.7%	6.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Pike	2	49.8%	37.4%	11.3%	1.0%	0.4%
Posey	1	49.6%	37.3%	11.3%	1.0%	0.8%
Spencer	1	49.6%	37.3%	11.3%	1.0%	0.8%
Sullivan	2	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Vanderburgh	1	49.6%	37.3%	11.3%	1.0%	0.8%
Warrick	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Daviess	1,178	6	2
Dubois	1,230	7	2
Gibson	1,515	86	314
Greene	1,430	8	2
Knox	1,487	8	2
Pike	935	5	1
Posey	1,296	11	16
Spencer	1,182	6	2
Sullivan	1,250	7	2
Vanderburgh	1,353	70	252
Warrick	1,211	7	2

 Table 144: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Table 145: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	10,894	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dubois	14,813	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gibson	12,847	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	13,372	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Knox	15,552	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pike	5,119	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Posey	10,205	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spencer	7,569	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sullivan	7,819	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vanderburgh	70,623	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warrick	19,438	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 146: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Daviess	5	93.7%	6.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Dubois	6	93.7%	6.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Gibson	5	49.9%	37.5%	11.3%	1.0%	0.2%
Greene	6	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Knox	3	93.7%	6.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Pike	3	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Posey	3	49.7%	37.4%	11.3%	1.0%	0.6%
Spencer	7	68.7%	24.0%	6.6%	0.6%	0.0%
Sullivan	6	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Vanderburgh	3	49.7%	37.4%	11.3%	1.0%	0.6%
Warrick	5	49.7%	37.4%	11.3%	1.0%	0.7%

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Daviess	707	5	1
Dubois	738	5	1
Gibson	909	68	248
Greene	858	6	2
Knox	892	6	2
Pike	561	4	1
Posey	777	8	12
Spencer	710	5	1
Sullivan	750	5	1
Vanderburgh	812	55	199
Warrick	727	5	1

 Table 147: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Table 148: Highway Bridge Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Daviess	136	98.62%	0.96%	0.25%	0.13%	0.02%
Dubois	192	99.55%	0.29%	0.08%	0.05%	0.01%
Gibson	293	92.32%	0.22%	0.06%	6.31%	1.06%
Greene	201	99.41%	0.38%	0.12%	0.07%	0.01%
Knox	288	99.35%	0.40%	0.14%	0.09%	0.01%
Pike	136	94.36%	0.19%	0.04%	5.02%	0.36%
Posey	191	96.06%	0.31%	0.17%	2.84%	0.60%
Spencer	212	94.24%	0.16%	0.11%	5.09%	0.37%
Sullivan	204	99.11%	0.60%	0.17%	0.09%	0.01%
Vanderburgh	188	90.87%	0.54%	0.09%	5.04%	3.43%
Warrick	173	94.17%	0.29%	0.09%	4.48%	0.95%

Table 149: Highway Bridge Functionality

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	136	99.36	99.67	99.76	99.78	99.84
Dubois	192	99.75	99.83	99.86	99.87	99.88
Gibson	293	92.73	92.80	92.92	93.47	96.69
Greene	201	99.67	99.79	99.84	99.85	99.87
Knox	288	99.63	99.76	99.82	99.83	99.87
Pike	136	94.67	94.72	94.81	95.25	97.77
Posey	191	96.41	96.54	96.64	96.90	98.35
Spencer	212	94.55	94.62	94.74	95.18	97.74
Sullivan	204	99.55	99.74	99.81	99.82	99.86
Vanderburgh	188	91.51	91.68	91.79	92.27	95.01
Warrick	173	94.56	94.66	94.76	95.16	97.45

Indiana – Wabash Valley Seismic Zone Scenario

This scenario for the State of Indiana includes the same set of 11 critical counties as listed in the NMSZ scenario discussion. As mentioned earlier, both scenarios produce the most substantial shaking in southwestern Indiana and thus the same set of counties is used. For a comparison of ground shaking values for the two Indiana scenarios please reference Appendix I.

The scenario consists of a $M_w7.1$ earthquake along the Wabash Valley Fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). Though the Wabash Valley Seismic Zone (WVSZ) covers significant area in southern Illinois, the actual fault modeled by the USGS is much shorter than the NMSZ faults. Figure 6 illustrates the location of the Wabash Valley fault utilized in the creation of USGS shaking maps for this seismic zone.



Figure 6: Wabash Valley Seismic Zone Fault for the State of Indiana

The WVSZ scenario generates thousands of cases of complete damage which is much greater than the level of complete damage from the NMSZ scenario. The fault rupture is much closer to the State of Indiana and thus the shaking is far more intense, particularly in the critical counties. Again, residential structures incur the majority of damage, both moderate and complete. Residential structures account for over 95% of all complete damage with single family homes contributing over 85% of complete damage cases. Moderate and severe dame shows similar estimates with single family homes incurring 70% of all moderate damage.

Nearly all complete damage, nearly 97%, occurs in the 11 critical counties in southwestern Indiana. Only 20% of all moderate and severe building damage occurs in this area, indicating that the moderate level of shaking outside the critical counties is enough to cause significant cracking of concrete and unreinforced masonry. With this many extreme damage cases in the critical counties and moderate damage extending to the north and west of that area, numerous people will be displaced over a much larger set of counties in Indiana.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)									
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage						
Single Family	1,675,434	5,315	7,464						
Other Residential	229,169	2,068	1,161						
Commercial	19,034	200	90						
Industrial	4,317	30	15						
Other	4,102	31	224						
Total	1,932,056	7,644	8,954						

Table 150: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Indiana

Table 151: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 11 Unlical Countie	Table 1	51: Damage	bv General	Occupancy	Type for	r the 11	Critical	Counties
--	---------	------------	------------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

General Occupancy Type Damage (11 Critical Counties)								
General Occupancy Type	neral Occupancy Total No. Type Buildings		Complete Damage					
Single Family	133,792	926	7,228					
Other Residential	21,966	540	1,085					
Commercial	1,410	24	90					
Industrial	279	7	15					
Other	1,967	6	224					
Total	159,414	1,503	8,642					

Table 152: Building Damage by Building Type for the State of Indiana

Building Damage by Building Type					
Building Type	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Wood	1,370,489	19,342	515	24	6,305
Steel	8,545	222	83	4	101
Concrete	2,655	72	13	0	44
Precast	2,912	107	46	2	51
Reinforced Masonry	1,717	41	15	0	14
Unreinforced Masonry	330,681	21,176	4,936	227	1,683
Mobile Home	148,359	9,140	1,767	13	756
Total	1,865,358	50,100	7,374	270	8,954

Building damage by building type is illustrated in Table 152 for the entire State of Indiana. The WVSZ scenario shows a substantial number of wood frame collapses though very few occurrences of damage in the less severe damage states. This is likely
due to liquefaction in the critical counties causing substantial settlements that damage structures severely. Roughly 70% of all complete damage is experienced by wood frame structures and nearly another 20% is attributed to URMs. Moderate damage is more common in URMs and mobile homes than any other type of construction.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality						
Essential Facility Type	Essential Facility TypeTotal No. FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete 					
Hospitals	175	0	0	174		
Schools	2,686	0	0	2,666		
EOCs	51	0	0	49		
Police Stations	474	0	0	466		
Fire Stations	1,210	0	0	1,195		

Table 153: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the State of Indiana⁶

 Table 154: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the 11 Critical Counties

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality							
Essential Facility Type	Essential acility TypeTotal No. FacilitiesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageAt Least Moderate 						
Hospitals	16	0	0	15			
Schools	223	0	0	203			
EOCs	6	0	0	4			
Police Stations	44	0	0	36			
Fire Stations	146	0	0	131			

Most essential facilities are not likely to incur moderate damage due to the WVSZ event, though lese severe damage levels are possible. While no essential facilities are expected to experience substantial damage some will have reduced functionality. Schools report the greatest loss of functionality with 20 schools not operating in Knox and Posey Counties. In addition, 15 fire stations 8 police stations and a hospital are not operating immediately after the earthquake. Most of these facilities are located in Know, Gibson, Posey and Dubois Counties. All facilities outside of the critical counties are fully operational the day after the earthquake.

⁶ For Tables 153-163 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Highway Bridge Damage Assessments						
	Total No. Of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
11 Critical Counties	2,220	0	0	2,220		
Remaining Counties	14,285	0	0	14,285		
Total State	16,505	0	0	16,505		

Table 155: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Table 156: Airport Damage Assessments

Airport Damage Assessments					
	Total No. Of Airports	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1	
11 Critical Counties	49	0	0	47	
Remaining Counties	447	0	0	447	
Total State	496	0	0	494	

Table 157: Transportation System Damage for the State of Indiana

Transportation System Damage						
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%	
Highway	Segments	2,844	0	0	2,844	
	Bridges	16,505	0	0	16,505	
	Tunnels	0	0	0	0	
Railways	Segments	4,988	0	0	4,988	
	Bridges	92	0	0	92	
	Tunnels	8	0	0	8	
	Facilities	91	0	0	91	
Bus	Facilities	46	1	0	46	
Light Rail	Segments	15	0	0	15	
_	Bridges	0	0	0	0	
	Facilities	13	13	13	0	
Ferry	Facilities	0	0	0	0	
Port	Facilities	91	0	0	91	
Airport	Facilities	496	5	0	494	
	Runways	538	0	0	538	

Transportation facilities and networks are similar to essential facilities in so far as facilities are not damaged significantly but there is some reduced functionality. Functionalities differ from damage states in that functionalities indicate the operational capabilities of various infrastructure components and do not indicate the level of damage sustained by that particular component. Damage state calculations are separate from

functionality calculations in impact assessment modeling. For example, a highway bridge may sustain minor damage, but still remain operational. Conversely, a bridge suffering severe structural damage and substantial settlement is likely not able to be used. The WVSZ scenario only impairs the functionality of several airports and those are located within the critical counties. All transportation lifelines outside the critical counties are fully operational the day after the earthquake.

There are no instances of complete damage to any utility facilities in the 11 critical counties or the remainder of the state. Numerous types of facilities, however, show cases of moderate or severe damage. Electric power and communication facilities show the most cases of damage with 23 and 435 moderately or severely damaged facilities, respectively. This level of damage impairs the functionality of all utility facilities, particularly in southwestern Indiana. Over 20 waste water facilities are estimated to be non-functional the day after the event in the 11 critical counties alone. Ten oil facilities will not be operational, which may impede the transport of oil through the central U.S. to other portions of the country. Over half, or 53, of all electric power facilities in southwestern Indiana are not operational meaning they can not provide power to customers. Those customers that did not experience substantial structural damage to their homes may be displaced due to lack of power, or even potable water. Furthermore, emergency response efforts may be impeded by the lack of electric power. Communication facilities report the greatest loss of functionality with over 130 facilities non-operational in the days immediately following the event. Without communication facilities functioning properly it may be difficult to coordinate emergency response and aid efforts.

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Potable Water FacilitiesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete Damage (Damage >50%)Functional >50% at D						
11 Critical Counties	16	4	0	12			
Remaining Counties	80	0	0	80			
Total State	96	4	0	92			

 Table 158: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

I HOLD IC / D'HIHHE' VO ' HOUD' ' HUUT I HOHHUU	Table 159:	Damage	to	Waste	Water	Facilities
---	------------	--------	----	-------	-------	------------

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Waste Water Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
11 Critical Counties	52	4	0	30		
Remaining Counties	394	0	0	394		
Total State	446	4	0	424		

Table 160: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments						
Total No. of Natural GasAt Least Moderate DamageComplete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functional >50% at Da						
11 Critical Counties	7	0	0	7		
Remaining Counties	22	0	0	22		
Total State	29	0	0	29		

Table 161: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments						
Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functiona >50% at Da						
11 Critical Counties	35	3	0	25		
Remaining Counties	135	0	0	135		
Total State	170	3	0	160		

Table 162: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Electric Power FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage >50% at DFunctional >50% at D						
11 Critical Counties	97	23	0	44			
Remaining Counties	695	0	0	695			
Total State	792	23	0	739			

Table 163: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
11 Critical Counties	2,490	432	0	2,359		
Remaining Counties	19,189	3	0	19,189		
Total State	21,679	435	0	21,548		

Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable water, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not present in the default inventory, or local inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional, or major transmission, oil pipelines are added from HSIP 2007 data to provide estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are comprised of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at 2,613 and 1,032, respectively. Local natural gas lines, however, show the greatest break and leak rates per length of pipe

at roughly 0.023 leaks/mile (roughly 1 leak every 43 miles) or 0.051 breaks/mile (roughly 1 break every 20 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of approximately 1,100 leaks and 2,400 breaks over the combined length of 54,746 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off to over 42,000 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This is reduced to 26,800 residences within a week, and all service is restored after three months. This period of time without water prevents people from remaining in their homes in the weeks immediately following the earthquake. As a result of the moderate level of shaking, electric power service is interrupted to nearly 15,000 residences in Indiana the day after the earthquake. Over 4,000 residences are still without power after one week. Almost all disruptions in potable water service and electrical power service occur in the 11 critical counties.

Pipeline Damage								
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks					
Potable Water - Local	111,394	1,032	2,613					
Waste Water - Local	66,836	816	2,067					
Natural Gas - Regional	10,188	31	111					
Natural Gas - Local	44,558	1,046	2,252					
Oil - Regional	4,625	56	219					

Table 164: Pipeline Damage

Table 165: Utility Service Interruptions

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service								
	No. Households (Critical Counties) Day 1 Day 3 Day 7 Day 30 Day 90							
Potable Water	199.251	42,022*	31,248	26,786	18,504	0		
Electric Power	100,201	14,994	9,419	4,185	1,169	19		

NOTE: All disruptions to potable water service and electrical power service occur in the 11 critical counties with the exception of 441 households that lose potable water service in Day 1.

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage level available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county. The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as

discussed in footnote (6) and employed in the preceding table for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Dubois County, Indiana 192 highway bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 6:
 - Summation of individual bridges after that bridges is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 0 at least moderately damaged highway bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of highway bridges in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of bridges in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the bridges in the county provides an estimate of 8 at least moderately damaged highway bridges

In the case of Dubois County, Indiana, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a higher estimate of damage as opposed to the waste water facility damage summation detailed in footnote (6). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Indiana are estimated to incur lesser damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges for the 11 critical counties in Indiana shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 146 at least moderately damaged highway bridges
- Total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 0 at least moderately damaged highway bridges

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces more damage. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix for the WVSZ scenario in Indiana.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the WVSZ scenario critical counties in Indiana. These tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage level for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Daviess						
Single Family	7,267	694	103	12	28	8,104
Other Residential	1,099	207	55	1	4	1,366
Commercial	62	11	3	0	0	76
Industrial	11	1	0	0	0	12
Other	18	2	0	0	0	20
Dubois						
Single Family	9,659	990	146	6	0	10,801
Other Residential	1,176	199	47	1	0	1,423
Commercial	102	22	7	0	0	131
Industrial	77	11	4	0	0	92
Other	15	2	1	0	0	18
Gibson						
Single Family	7,121	829	123	10	1,398	9,481
Other Residential	1,101	339	95	1	324	1,860
Commercial	44	10	3	0	6	63
Industrial	6	1	1	0	1	9
Other	15	3	1	0	3	22
Greene						
Single Family	9,051	45	3	0	0	9,099
Other Residential	3,376	92	5	0	0	3,473
Commercial	77	1	0	0	0	78
Industrial	9	0	0	0	0	9
Other	20	0	0	0	0	20
Knox						
Single Family	7,753	1,321	188	12	1,784	11,058
Other Residential	965	346	92	2	294	1,699
Commercial	69	17	5	0	22	113
Industrial	10	2	1	0	4	17
Other	16	4	1	0	5	26
Pike						
Single Family	3,366	115	16	1	0	3,498
Other Residential	1,055	157	41	0	0	1,253
Commercial	16	1	0	0	0	17
Industrial	4	0	0	0	0	4
Other	4	0	0	0	0	5
Posey						
Single Family	6,589	1,001	151	15	276	8,032
Other Residential	745	327	95	2	36	1,205
Commercial	21	5	2	0	2	30
Industrial	6	2	1	0	1	10
Other	8	2	1	0	1	12

Table 166: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Spencer						
Single Family	5,837	29	2	0	0	5,868
Other Residential	1,108	29	2	0	0	1,139
Commercial	46	0	0	0	0	46
Industrial	6	0	0	0	0	6
Other	26	0	0	0	0	26
Sullivan						
Single Family	4,931	672	98	5	25	5,730
Other Residential	948	325	92	1	5	1,371
Commercial	17	4	1	0	0	22
Industrial	1	0	0	0	0	1
Other	2	1	0	0	0	3
Vanderburgh						
Single Family	42,962	287	26	5	3,718	46,998
Other Residential	4,663	75	5	0	422	5,165
Commercial	666	7	1	0	59	733
Industrial	93	1	0	0	9	103
Other	1,565	17	2	0	216	1,800
Warrick						
Single Family	15,045	75	5	0	0	15,125
Other Residential	1,960	49	3	0	0	2,013
Commercial	96	1	0	0	0	97
Industrial	18	0	0	0	0	18
Other	15	0	0	0	0	15

Table 167: Hospital Functionality

	T-4-1#-6	Da	y 1	Da	y 3	Daj	y 7	Day	v 30	Day	90
Counties	Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%						
Daviess	85	56	65.50	56	66.00	73	85.60	84	98.40	84	98.80
Dubois	218	144	66.10	145	66.60	189	86.50	216	99.20	217	99.60
Gibson	109	71	65.50	72	66.00	93	85.60	107	98.40	108	98.80
Greene	75	74	98.10	74	98.10	75	99.60	75	99.90	75	99.90
Knox	260	129	49.60	130	49.90	168	64.80	193	74.40	194	74.70
Pike	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Posey	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spencer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sullivan	35	23	66.10	23	66.60	30	86.50	35	99.20	35	99.60
Vanderburgh	1,319	1137	86.20	1137	86.20	1155	87.60	1158	87.80	1159	87.90
Warrick	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

*Note: Discrepancies between the number of hospital beds and the percentages of beds may occur due to rounding.

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Daviess	3	69.47
Dubois	5	63.08
Gibson	3	69.47
Greene	5	96.60
Knox	3	45.83
Pike	4	96.60
Posey	5	49.20
Spencer	2	96.60
Sullivan	3	69.80
Vanderburgh	7	80.83
Warrick	4	96.60

Table 168: Police Station Functionality

Table 169: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Daviess	21	71.40
Dubois	21	73.30
Gibson	20	65.99
Greene	14	96.60
Knox	18	46.83
Pike	5	88.56
Posey	14	58.04
Spencer	13	92.28
Sullivan	10	68.27
Vanderburgh	66	86.25
Warrick	21	95.37

Table 170: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Daviess	12	75.08
Dubois	14	82.24
Gibson	13	71.55
Greene	14	96.60
Knox	19	50.94
Pike	8	91.58
Posey	10	50.71
Spencer	7	91.59
Sullivan	12	62.54
Vanderburgh	26	86.95
Warrick	11	96.60

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	167	84.05	95.77	97.25	99.55	99.88
Dubois	274	93.17	98.87	99.37	99.88	99.90
Gibson	235	78.26	92.40	94.50	98.31	99.67
Greene	155	88.98	97.48	98.44	99.77	99.90
Knox	301	56.36	77.04	82.38	93.90	98.88
Pike	127	91.76	98.39	99.05	99.83	99.90
Posey	200	86.39	96.46	97.67	99.53	99.87
Spencer	127	93.11	98.81	99.31	99.84	99.90
Sullivan	184	65.64	85.20	89.51	97.92	99.61
Vanderburgh	507	93.13	98.71	99.21	99.77	99.90
Warrick	213	93.14	98.84	99.34	99.86	99.90

Table 171: Communication Functionality

Table 172: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	10,894	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dubois	14,813	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gibson	12,847	94.15	93.34	91.29	40.71	0.00
Greene	13,372	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Knox	15,552	97.72	97.45	96.82	85.35	0.00
Pike	5,119	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Posey	10,205	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spencer	7,569	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sullivan	7,819	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vanderburgh	70,623	20.23	5.81	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warrick	19,438	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 173: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Daviess	2	19.7%	42.2%	30.8%	6.6%	0.7%
Dubois	3	49.9%	37.5%	11.3%	1.0%	0.2%
Gibson	1	6.8%	27.3%	35.7%	13.6%	16.6%
Greene	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Knox	1	7.9%	31.9%	41.6%	15.9%	2.6%
Pike	2	49.9%	37.5%	11.3%	1.0%	0.3%
Posey	1	49.8%	37.4%	11.3%	1.0%	0.5%
Spencer	1	49.8%	37.4%	11.3%	1.0%	0.5%
Sullivan	2	2.0%	15.3%	39.0%	32.6%	11.0%
Vanderburgh	1	49.8%	37.4%	11.3%	1.0%	0.5%
Warrick	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Daviess	1,178	5	4
Dubois	1,230	4	1
Gibson	1,515	243	950
Greene	1,430	5	1
Knox	1,487	339	1,335
Pike	935	3	1
Posey	1,296	9	20
Spencer	1,182	4	1
Sullivan	1,250	8	17
Vanderburgh	1,353	38	132
Warrick	1,211	4	1

 Table 174: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Table 175: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	10,894	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dubois	14,813	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gibson	12,847	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greene	13,372	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Knox	15,552	73.08	47.38	22.47	6.83	0.09
Pike	5,119	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Posey	10,205	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spencer	7,569	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sullivan	7,819	46.40	26.23	8.82	1.37	0.06
Vanderburgh	70,623	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warrick	19,438	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 176: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Daviess	5	31.5%	39.5%	22.4%	4.2%	2.4%
Dubois	6	50.0%	37.6%	11.3%	1.0%	0.1%
Gibson	5	25.6%	40.9%	26.6%	5.4%	1.5%
Greene	6	45.0%	38.4%	14.6%	1.9%	0.2%
Knox	3	10.2%	30.8%	36.4%	14.8%	7.8%
Pike	3	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Posey	3	29.4%	39.9%	23.8%	4.6%	2.2%
Spencer	7	50.0%	37.6%	11.3%	1.0%	0.1%
Sullivan	6	15.8%	38.8%	34.4%	9.7%	1.3%
Vanderburgh	3	49.9%	37.5%	11.3%	1.0%	0.3%
Warrick	5	49.8%	37.5%	11.3%	1.0%	0.4%

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Daviess	707	4	3
Dubois	738	4	1
Gibson	909	192	751
Greene	858	4	1
Knox	892	268	1,056
Pike	561	3	1
Posey	777	7	16
Spencer	710	3	1
Sullivan	750	7	13
Vanderburgh	812	30	105
Warrick	727	3	1

Table 177: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Table 178: Highway Bridge Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Daviess	136	93.72%	0.95%	0.18%	1.24%	3.90%
Dubois	192	94.87%	0.25%	0.12%	4.28%	0.45%
Gibson	293	88.58%	0.25%	0.05%	2.57%	8.52%
Greene	201	97.81%	0.30%	0.20%	1.26%	0.41%
Knox	288	86.16%	1.90%	0.10%	1.89%	9.93%
Pike	136	93.77%	0.14%	0.04%	3.73%	2.31%
Posey	191	93.96%	0.36%	0.19%	1.05%	4.42%
Spencer	212	94.13%	0.12%	0.13%	5.36%	0.25%
Sullivan	204	95.13%	1.76%	0.13%	0.41%	2.56%
Vanderburgh	188	92.83%	0.23%	0.07%	5.82%	1.02%
Warrick	173	94.82%	0.18%	0.07%	4.49%	0.42%

Table 179: Highway Bridge Functionality

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Daviess	136	94.54	94.83	94.91	95.08	95.97
Dubois	192	95.22	95.32	95.40	95.80	97.97
Gibson	293	89.00	89.07	89.14	89.48	91.35
Greene	201	98.09	98.21	98.30	98.43	99.08
Knox	288	87.81	88.35	88.42	88.72	90.34
Pike	136	94.02	94.07	94.12	94.49	96.50
Posey	191	94.35	94.49	94.58	94.74	95.57
Spencer	212	94.42	94.49	94.58	95.08	97.77
Sullivan	204	96.48	96.96	97.02	97.09	97.47
Vanderburgh	188	93.23	93.32	93.39	93.94	96.91
Warrick	173	95.11	95.18	95.24	95.66	97.92

Kentucky – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 120 counties in the State of Kentucky. Kentucky is approximately 40,400 square miles and is bordered by Indiana and Ohio to the north, Tennessee to the south, West Virginia and Virginia to the east and Illinois and Missouri to the west. For the purposes of this analysis, 25 critical counties have been identified in the western portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 25 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document. The critical counties are listed below:

- Ballard •
- Caldwell •
- Calloway •
- Carlisle •
- Christian •
- Crittenden
- Daviess

- Fulton
- Graves
- Hancock •
- Henderson •
- Hickman •
- Hopkins •
- Livingston •

- Logan
- Lyon
- McCracken
- McLean
- Marshall
- Muhlenberg
- Ohio

The NMSZ scenario for the State of Kentucky consists of a magnitude 7.7 (M_w7.7) earthquake along the northeast extension of the presumed eastern fault line in the New Madrid fault system. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for the middle fault in the proposed New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ). Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northeastern, central, and southwestern. This scenario, the worst case event for Kentucky, employs an event in the northeast segment of the eastern fault. The location of this scenario event is illustrated in Figure 7. For more information on the ground motion used in this scenario please reference Appendix I.



Figure 7: Scenario Fault Location for the State of Kentucky

- - Todd Trigg
 - Union
 - Webster

Within the State of Kentucky, nearly 29,000 buildings experience complete damage, which are included in the nearly 53,000 at least moderately damaged buildings. While this is roughly 2% of all Kentucky buildings, many of these collapsed structures are concentrated in the western counties. As with previous state scenarios, residential buildings experience the greatest amount of damage. Nearly 98% of all building collapses occur to residential structures. In addition, about 94% of all at least moderate damage occurs in the 25 critical counties for Kentucky.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	1,159,114	39,150	18,768			
Other Residential	292,873	13,050	9,673			
Commercial	16,431	306	475			
Industrial	3,002	48	53			
Other	1,900	34	60			
Total	1,473,320	52,588	29,029			

Table 180: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Kentucky

Table 181: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 25 Critical Counties

General Occupancy Type Damage (25 Critical Counties)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	189,655	38,707	18,652			
Other Residential	50,493	10,619	9,619			
Commercial	1,682	259	475			
Industrial	265	37	53			
Other	242	29	60			
Total	242,337	49,651	28,859			

Wood frame construction is the most common type of building in the State of Kentucky and also generates the most cases of complete damage. Over 47% of all collapses, 13,700 buildings, is experienced by wood frame structures. Unreinforced masonry (URM) construction and mobile homes (MH) also show high frequencies of collapse and account for nearly all non-wood construction building collapses. This damage state is identified by significant cracking to unreinforced masonry walls as well as some connection damage to column/beam joints in unreinforced masonry building. The remaining building types show far less inventory throughout the state and thus experience a far lesser proportion of damage.

Building Damage by Building Type						
Building Type	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete	
Wood	992,135	18,737	24,772	11,617	13,726	
Steel	6,430	264	93	39	201	
Concrete	1,782	51	22	15	58	
Precast	1,907	74	42	19	69	
Reinforced Masonry	1,109	20	13	10	39	
Unreinforced Masonry	137,881	8352	2,434	1,720	6,161	
Mobile Home	197,127	25935	7,952	3,840	8,775	
Total	1,338,371	53,433	35,328	17,260	29,029	

Table 182: Building Damage by Building Type for the State of Kentucky

Of the 1,066 fire stations in the state, 77 (more than 7%) are estimated to experience at least moderate damage. Approximately 5-7% of most other essential facility types (schools, hospitals, and police stations) each sustain at least moderate damage. In addition, 79 of the 1,846 schools and 61 fire stations are estimated to collapse. All of these facilities are in the most western counties in Kentucky. The Kentucky inventory does not specify any locations for emergency operations centers, thus no damage can be determined for this type of essential facility.

Not only are numerous facilities damaged but many facilities located in the western portion of Kentucky are not functional in the days immediately after the earthquake. All of the non-functional facilities are located in the western portion of the state. Of Kentucky's 135 hospitals, 118 are considered functional the day after the earthquake and after one week that number increases to 129 functional facilities. Roughly 90% of all fire stations and police stations in Kentucky are estimated to remain functional the day after the earthquake, the earthquake, though all of these functioning facilities are located in the central and eastern portions of the state. Most of Kentucky's western counties are left without functioning facilities and will likely experience diminished services in the immediate aftermath of an earthquake.

Transportation lifelines, particularly in western Kentucky counties incur the most severe damage. Roughly 200 of the 6,800, or approximately 3% of all bridges, are estimated to incur at least moderate damage. Of the nearly 200 damaged bridges, almost 50 are expected to collapse. These collapses are shown to occur in counties along the western border of Kentucky. Highway road segments connecting these damaged bridges are expected to incur slightly less damage than the bridges themselves, even in the counties with the most severe shaking. Highway segments are most generally defined as a section of highway between two end nodes. These end nodes are frequently highway bridges. At least moderate damage to highway bridges is characterized by moderate shear (diagonal) cracking of columns, spalling of cover concrete and shear keys, abutment movement less than two-inches, extensive cracking to shear keys, bent connection bolts, and moderate settlement of the bridge approaches.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (State)						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
Hospitals	135	6	4	118		
Schools	1,846	98	79	1,713		
EOCs	0	0	0	0		
Police Stations	407	23	19	373		
Fire Stations	1,066	77	61	959		

 Table 183: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the State of Kentucky⁷

Table 184: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the 25 Critical Counties

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (25 Critical Counties)						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
Hospitals	21	6	4	5		
Schools	301	98	79	168		
EOCs	0	0	0	0		
Police Stations	77	23	19	44		
Fire Stations	238	77	61	133		

Table 185: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments						
	Total No. Of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
25 Critical Counties	2,173	197	46	1,974		
Remaining Counties	4,632	0	0	4,630		
Total State	6,805	197	46	6604		

Table 186: Airport Damage Assessments

Airport Damage Assessments						
	Total No. Of Airports	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
25 Critical Counties	53	19	1	40		
Remaining Counties	166	0	0	166		
Total State	219	19	1	206		

⁷ For Tables 183-193 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Furthermore, 86 ports, 23 railway facilities and 19 airports reach at least moderate damage state and follow roughly the same damage distribution throughout the state as highway bridges. At least moderate damage to port facilities includes considerable ground settlement, derailment of port equipment and damage to structural members. For airports, at least moderate damage is defined in the same manner as damage to other building types discussed previously. The lack of functionality of many transportation lifelines in western Kentucky will make the movement of people and supplies difficult in the days immediately following the earthquake.

	Transportation System Damage						
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%		
Highway	Segments	9,481	0	0	9,481		
	Bridges	6,805	197	46	6,604		
	Tunnels	4	0	0	4		
Railways	Segments	2,761	0	0	2,761		
-	Bridges	166	3	0	163		
	Tunnels	18	0	0	18		
	Facilities	117	23	0	96		
Bus	Facilities	26	2	0	25		
Light Rail	Segments	0	0	0	0		
-	Bridges	0	0	0	0		
	Facilities	0	0	0	0		
Ferry	Facilities	16	16	16	0		
Port	Facilities	301	86	14	221		
Airport	Facilities	219	19	1	206		
	Runways	155	0	0	155		

 Table 187: Transportation System Damage for the State of Kentucky

Table 188: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Potable Water Facilities	Fotal No. of otable WaterAt Least Moderate DamageComplete Damage (Damage >50%)Facilities(Damage >50%)						
25 Critical Counties	36	11	0	27				
Remaining Counties	143	0	0	143				
Total State	179	11	0	170				

Utility lifelines' damage and functionality are similar to those found for the transportation systems. Over 500 waste water facilities are moderately or more severely damaged while 81 incur complete damage. Approximately 1,050 communication facilities incur at least moderate damage, while 133 experience complete damage. Additionally, 8% of all electric power facilities reach at least moderate damage state.

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Waste Water Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1					
25 Critical Counties	1,561	523	81	764				
Remaining Counties	7,530	0	0	7,530				
Total State	9,081	523	81	8,294				

Table 189: Damage to Waste Water Facilities

Table 190: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Natural Gas Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)	Least Moderate Damage amage > 50%) Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)				
25 Critical Counties	24	6	4	0			
Remaining Counties	313	0	0	313			
Total State	337	6	4	313			

Table 191: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage >50Fut >50							
25 Critical Counties	31	6	1	23				
Remaining Counties	57	0	0	57				
Total State	88	6	1	80				

Table 192: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Electric Power Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1			
25 Critical Counties	463	132	40	231			
Remaining Counties	1,230	0	0	1,230			
Total State	1,693	132	40	1,461			

Table 193: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1					
25 Critical Counties	3,262	1,044	133	2,410				
Remaining Counties	13,095	0	0	13,095				
Total State	16,357	1,044	133	15,505				

Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable water, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not included in the HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory, called local inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional oil pipelines are added to provide damage estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are composed of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at roughly 7,283 and 7,804, respectively. Local natural gas lines experience the greatest leak and break rates per length of pipe, at roughly 0.16 leaks/mile (1 leak every 6.2 miles) and approximately 0.15 breaks/mile (1 break every 6.7 miles), respectively. In addition, estimates for local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of 6,702 leaks and 6,457 breaks over the combined length of 48,499 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off to nearly 109,000 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This number is reduced to roughly 67,000 residences within a week. After three months, potable water service is restored for all residences, as shown in Table 195. These estimates are calculated employing a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the rate of repair. Additional information on this formula is available in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual that accompanies the program. This period of time without water prevents thousands of people from remaining in their homes in the weeks and months following the earthquake. Electric power service shows similar trends, with over 77,000 residences without electric power the day after the earthquake, or nearly 5% of all State residences. Even a month after the earthquake, over 36,000 residences are still without power. All electric power lines in Kentucky are presumed to be above ground and less likely to incur damage from moderate ground shaking, unlike buried pipelines that are vulnerable to damage from liquefaction and ground deformation.

Pipeline Damage							
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks				
Potable Water - Local	102,749	7,804	7,283				
Waste Water - Local	61,650	6,173	5,760				
Natural Gas - Regional	7,399	104	300				
Natural Gas - Local	41,100	6,598	6,157				
Oil - Regional	1,165	43	116				

Table 194: Pipeline Damage

 Table 195: Utility Service Interruptions for the State of Kentucky

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service									
No. Households Day 1 Day 3 Day 7 Day 30 Day 9									
Potable Water	1 500 647	108,556	92,742	66,608	38,694	0			
Electric Power	1,590,647	77,263	60,273	36,450	11,464	86			

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county. The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (7) and employed in the preceding damage tables for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Lyon County, Kentucky 33 waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 7:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 24 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of 18 at least moderately damages waste water facilities

In the case of Lyon County, Kentucky, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a lower estimate of damage as oppose to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (7). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Kentucky are estimated to incur greater damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities for the 25 critical counties in Kentucky shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 663 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 523 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces greater damage. This trend holds true for other infrastructure types including highway bridges.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Kentucky. There tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage levels for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Ballard						
Single Family	5	172	1,038	722	749	2,686
Other Residential	0	1	40	158	562	761
Commercial	0	0	0	2	13	15
Industrial	0	0	0	0	6	6
Other	0	0	0	0	4	4
Caldwell						
Single Family	3,696	495	61	4	6	4,262
Other Residential	440	327	180	5	2	954
Commercial	22	9	4	0	0	35
Industrial	3	2	1	0	0	6
Other	2	0	0	0	0	2
Calloway						
Single Family	2,030	4,143	2,463	368	615	9,619
Other Residential	412	748	1,192	910	381	3,643
Commercial	3	16	47	35	17	118
Industrial	0	0	2	2	1	5
Other	0	32	5	54	2	93
Carlisle						
Single Family	1	45	455	633	607	1,741
Other Residential	0	0	1	23	471	495
Commercial	0	0	0	0	12	12
Industrial	0	0	0	0	2	2
Other	0	0	0	0	5	5
Christian						
Single Family	14,778	1,980	242	11	0	17,011
Other Residential	2,235	1,265	654	17	0	4,171
Commercial	99	42	17	1	0	159
Industrial	17	8	5	0	0	30
Other	15	5	2	0	0	22
Crittenden						
Single Family	2,321	311	38	2	0	2,672
Other Residential	486	399	224	5	0	1,114
Commercial	7	3	1	0	0	11
Industrial	2	1	1	0	0	4
Other	2	0	0	0	0	2
Daviess						
Single Family	24,709	545	59	3	2,850	28,166
Other Residential	3,095	364	123	2	335	3,919
Commercial	256	8	1	0	39	304
Industrial	21	1	0	0	3	25
Other	23	0	0	0	3	26

Table 196: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Fulton						
Single Family	24	364	819	509	681	2,397
Other Residential	2	22	50	47	227	348
Commercial	0	0	0	1	15	16
Industrial	0	0	0	0	3	3
Other	0	0	0	0	4	4
Graves						
Single Family	76	1,499	5,201	2,202	2,326	11,304
Other Residential	1	37	308	688	1,741	2,775
Commercial	0	0	8	21	49	78
Industrial	0	0	1	3	19	23
Other	0	0	1	2	10	13
Hancock						
Single Family	2,314	14	1	0	0	2,329
Other Residential	844	85	10	0	0	939
Commercial	8	0	0	0	0	8
Industrial	10	0	0	0	0	10
Other	1	0	0	0	0	1
Henderson						
Single Family	9,907	1,452	176	9	1,294	12,838
Other Residential	1,473	892	469	12	272	3,118
Commercial	74	31	13	1	22	141
Industrial	23	11	6	1	3	44
Other	10	3	1	0	4	18
Hickman						
Single Family	2	118	862	414	307	1,703
Other Residential	0	0	4	33	424	461
Commercial	0	0	0	0	5	5
Industrial	0	0	0	0	1	1
Other	0	0	0	0	4	4
Hopkins						
Single Family	11,326	1,518	186	11	818	13,859
Other Residential	1,647	1,219	670	17	190	3,743
Commercial	81	34	14	1	5	135
Industrial	14	7	4	0	0	25
Other	16	6	2	0	1	25
Livingston						
Single Family	1,078	1,067	583	85	109	2,922
Other Residential	206	255	453	368	106	1,388
Commercial	3	5	10	7	3	28
Industrial	1	0	1	1	0	3
Other	2	1	2	1	0	6

(None)	(Slight)	(Moderate)	(Extensive)	(Complete)	Total
8,039 1,987 63 18 11	50 187 2 1 0	3 23 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	8,092 2,197 65 19 11
	Ŭ	0	Ū	Ū	
2,175 492 14 0 4	386 394 6 0 2	46 219 2 0 0	2 5 0 0	59 34 1 0	2,668 1,144 23 0 6
			_		_
164 2 0 0	2,569 42 1 0 0	5,461 495 8 1 1	1,244 1,072 20 2 2	1,115 1,350 39 5 5	10,553 2,961 68 8 8
Ū	Ŭ	•	_	J	Ũ
11 0 0 0 0	705 26 0 0 0	7,951 371 5 0 2	6,619 873 32 1 3	5,431 3,032 241 8 16	20,717 4,302 278 9 21
2,351 868 11 0 3	130 225 2 0 0	15 96 1 0 0	1 2 0 0 0	113 53 1 0 0	2,610 1,244 15 0 3
8,250 2,791 47 4 18	52 272 1 0 0	3 34 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	256 78 4 1 2	8,561 3,175 52 5 20
-	-	-	- -		-
6,020 2,357 33 6	38 230 1 0	3 28 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	6,061 2,615 34 6
	(None) 8,039 1,987 63 18 11 2,175 492 14 0 4 164 2 0 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Orone Oron 8,039 50 1,987 187 63 2 18 1 11 0 2,175 386 492 394 14 6 0 0 492 394 14 6 0 0 492 394 14 6 0 0 164 2,569 2 42 0 1 0 0 0 0 11 705 0 26 0 0 0 0 0 0 2,351 130 868 225 11 2 0 0 3 0 8250 52 2,791 272 47 1 4	NoneStead(Moderate) $(None)$ (Slight)(Moderate) $8,039$ 503 $1,987$ 187 23 63 20 18 10 11 00 11 00 $2,175$ 386 46 492 394 219 14 62 0 00 4 20 14 62 0 00 4 20 14 6371 0 18 0 18 0 01 11 705 $7,951$ 0 00 0 02 11 26 371 0 00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 0 0 11 2 388 225 96 11 2 34 47 47 1 0 0 447 1 0 0 18 0 0 38 33 1 0 0 6 0	(None)(Slight)(Moderate)(Extensive)8,03950301,987187230632001810011000110002,175386462492394219514620000042004200018200182001820012320012018736,619026371873005320010117057,9516,6190263718730012117053230010112100003000011210000011100000112100013100140015116231730180	(None)(Slight)(Moderate)(Extensive)(Complete) $8,039$ 50300 $1,987$ 187 23 00 63 2000 18 1000 18 1000 11 0000 14 6259 492 394219534 14 62010000042000742495 $1,072$ $1,350$ 01820390012501820390012500182011705 $7,951$ $6,619$ $5,431$ 026371 873 $3,032$ 0018211705 $7,951$ $6,619$ $5,431$ 0018211705 $7,951$ $6,619$ $5,431$ 0018211705 $7,951$ $6,619$ $5,431$ 0001800018000001121011386822596253

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Todd						
Single Family	3,359	21	1	0	0	3,381
Other Residential	986	99	12	0	0	1,097
Commercial	9	0	0	0	0	9
Industrial	5	0	0	0	0	5
Other	11	0	0	0	0	11
Trigg						
Single Family	4,171	559	68	3	0	4,801
Other Residential	637	514	287	7	0	1,445
Commercial	14	6	2	0	0	22
Industrial	9	4	3	0	0	16
Other	3	1	0	0	0	4
Union						
Single Family	2,664	547	64	4	1,092	4,371
Other Residential	414	334	186	5	313	1,252
Commercial	16	7	3	0	8	34
Industrial	3	1	1	0	1	6
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Webster						
Single Family	3,567	478	59	3	224	4,331
Other Residential	494	417	235	6	80	1,232
Commercial	10	4	2	0	1	17
Industrial	2	1	1	0	0	4
Other	4	1	0	0	0	5

	T (1 //	Day	y 1	Day	y 3	Da	ny 7	Da	y 30	Day	y 90
Counties	of Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%
Ballard	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Caldwell	15	7	46.67	7	46.67	11	73.33	15	100.00	15	100.00
Calloway	378	2	0.53	2	0.53	10	2.65	110	29.10	212	56.08
Carlisle	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Christian	592	282	47.64	286	48.31	436	73.65	578	97.64	585	98.82
Crittenden	48	23	47.92	23	47.92	35	72.92	47	97.92	47	97.92
Daviess	469	422	89.98	423	90.19	435	92.75	438	93.39	438	93.39
Fulton	70	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	2.86	28	40.00	45	64.29
Graves	106	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.89
Hancock	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Henderson	205	73	35.61	74	36.10	113	55.12	150	73.17	152	74.15
Hickman	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Hopkins	401	191	47.63	194	48.38	295	73.57	391	97.51	396	98.75
Livingston	26	12	46.15	12	46.15	19	73.08	25	96.15	26	100.00
Logan	92	89	96.74	89	96.74	91	98.91	92	100.00	92	100.00
Lyon	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Marshall	563	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.18
McCracken	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
McLean	84	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.19
Muhlenberg	135	130	96.30	130	96.30	134	99.26	135	100.00	135	100.00
Ohio	49	47	95.92	47	95.92	49	100.00	49	100.00	49	100.00
Todd	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Trigg	25	12	48.00	12	48.00	18	72.00	24	96.00	25	100.00
Union	54	24	44.44	24	44.44	37	68.52	49	90.74	50	92.59
Webster	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A

Table 197: Hospital Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Ballard	2	0.00
Caldwell	2	51.90
Calloway	3	0.73
Carlisle	2	0.00
Christian	6	51.90
Crittenden	2	51.90
Daviess	2	81.60
Fulton	3	0.00
Graves	3	0.00
Hancock	3	94.10
Henderson	3	45.30
Hickman	2	0.00
Hopkins	7	51.90
Livingston	1	0.80
Logan	5	94.10
Lyon	2	47.00
Marshall	3	0.00
McCracken	4	0.00
McLean	2	51.90
Muhlenberg	3	94.10
Ohio	3	89.93
Todd	4	94.10
Trigg	2	51.90
Union	4	39.65
Webster	4	49.38

Table 198: Police Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Ballard	7	0.00
Caldwell	6	51.90
Calloway	13	0.80
Carlisle	4	0.00
Christian	27	51.90
Crittenden	3	51.90
Daviess	45	80.67
Fulton	9	0.00
Graves	18	0.00
Hancock	4	94.10
Henderson	16	44.00
Hickman	3	0.00
Hopkins	23	51.59
Livingston	5	14.60
Logan	15	94.10
Lyon	5	47.00
Marshall	13	0.00
McCracken	28	0.00
McLean	6	64.83
Muhlenberg	12	94.10
Ohio	12	89.93
Todd	7	94.10
Trigg	5	51.90
Union	7	42.76
Webster	8	51.08

Table 199: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Ballard	10	0.00
Caldwell	3	51.90
Calloway	11	12.91
Carlisle	6	0.00
Christian	23	51.90
Crittenden	7	51.90
Daviess	17	78.29
Fulton	3	0.00
Graves	18	0.00
Hancock	4	94.10
Henderson	14	46.19
Hickman	5	0.00
Hopkins	18	51.52
Livingston	8	12.30
Logan	6	94.10
Lyon	4	47.00
Marshall	12	0.00
McCracken	9	0.00
McLean	8	76.71
Muhlenberg	8	92.54
Ohio	9	91.32
Todd	7	94.10
Trigg	11	51.90
Union	8	40.40
Webster	9	51.17

 Table 200: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Ballard	92	22.21	31.44	41.11	69.63	94.55
Caldwell	70	78.28	93.85	95.95	99.38	99.88
Calloway	111	54.85	76.56	82.38	94.77	99.03
Carlisle	42	25.33	37.56	47.96	76.44	95.79
Christian	265	89.51	97.68	98.58	99.80	99.90
Crittenden	61	77.69	93.40	95.58	99.20	99.84
Daviess	338	92.83	98.53	99.03	99.59	99.84
Fulton	63	31.29	47.21	56.97	82.15	96.82
Graves	158	33.29	50.54	60.26	84.62	97.23
Hancock	85	99.70	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Henderson	320	86.22	95.32	96.42	98.40	99.63
Hickman	43	28.77	43.93	54.51	81.69	96.68
Hopkins	255	89.92	97.75	98.59	99.74	99.88
Livingston	82	43.75	64.76	72.93	91.61	98.45
Logan	125	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Lyon	62	66.78	87.10	91.10	98.48	99.68
Marshall	146	38.80	57.97	66.24	86.48	97.54
McCracken	251	24.67	36.00	45.71	73.31	95.23
McLean	53	93.00	98.70	99.20	99.73	99.87
Muhlenberg	177	93.16	98.86	99.36	99.87	99.89
Ohio	127	93.10	98.80	99.30	99.81	99.88
Todd	63	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Trigg	71	78.40	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Union	113	77.54	92.90	95.00	98.67	99.69
Webster	89	85.36	96.00	97.30	99.37	99.82

Table 201: Communication Functionality

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Ballard	3,395	99.41	99.26	98.76	0.00	0.00
Caldwell	5,431	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Calloway	13,862	55.34	42.19	7.59	0.00	0.00
Carlisle	2,208	98.19	97.24	92.71	0.00	0.00
Christian	24,857	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crittenden	3,829	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Daviess	36,033	34.44	20.03	0.02	0.00	0.00
Fulton	3,237	98.33	97.62	94.84	0.00	0.00
Graves	14,841	99.34	99.28	99.12	96.83	0.00
Hancock	3,215	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Henderson	18,095	38.88	22.65	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hickman	2,188	97.71	96.66	92.37	0.00	0.00
Hopkins	18,820	61.06	51.14	23.07	0.00	0.00
Livingston	3,996	22.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Logan	10,506	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lyon	2,898	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	27,152	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marshall	12,412	69.05	58.86	25.88	0.00	0.00
Mason	6,847	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Muhlenberg	12,357	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ohio	8,899	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Todd	4,569	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Trigg	5,215	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Union	5,710	97.93	97.48	96.09	0.00	0.00
Webster	5,560	27.09	2.55	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 202: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Ballard	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Caldwell	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Calloway	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carlisle	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Christian	2	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Crittenden	1	0.20	0.42	0.31	0.07	0.01
Daviess	2	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.01
Fulton	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Graves	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hancock	2	0.94	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Henderson	1	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.01
Hickman	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hopkins	2	0.35	0.40	0.21	0.04	0.00
Livingston	3	0.02	0.13	0.36	0.32	0.18
Logan	2	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Lyon	3	0.12	0.35	0.37	0.12	0.04
Marshall	3	0.02	0.13	0.35	0.32	0.18
McCracken	3	0.00	0.03	0.20	0.38	0.38
McLean	2	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.00
Muhlenberg	2	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Ohio	3	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.00
Todd	1	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Trigg	1	0.20	0.42	0.31	0.07	0.01
Union	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Webster	3	0.29	0.40	0.24	0.05	0.03

 Table 203: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Ballard	500	675	718
Caldwell	708	4	3
Calloway	1,129	143	229
Carlisle	376	968	384
Christian	1,615	9	2
Crittenden	694	4	1
Daviess	1,399	53	185
Fulton	442	941	459
Graves	1,318	1,200	1,780
Hancock	474	3	1
Henderson	1,203	50	177
Hickman	446	996	417
Hopkins	1,267	78	284
Livingston	571	65	73
Logan	1,271	7	2
Lyon	597	26	32
Madison	981	418	266
Marshall	997	1,447	1,180
Mason	519	14	45
Muhlenberg	1,193	17	43
Ohio	1,289	7	2
Todd	712	4	1
Trigg	1,044	6	1
Union	773	187	732
Webster	767	29	99

 Table 204: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Ballard	3,395	95.58	87.22	67.01	26.10	0.09
Caldwell	5,431	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Calloway	13,862	79.17	48.43	18.66	3.64	0.10
Carlisle	2,208	94.47	82.47	57.38	19.43	0.09
Christian	24,857	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crittenden	3,829	13.76	7.00	1.91	0.24	0.03
Daviess	36,033	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fulton	3,237	91.75	74.51	46.18	14.15	0.09
Graves	14,841	90.93	72.19	43.30	13.11	0.10
Hancock	3,215	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Henderson	18,095	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hickman	2,188	93.19	78.02	49.82	15.08	0.09
Hopkins	18,820	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Livingston	3,996	86.26	61.11	29.40	6.58	0.10
Logan	10,506	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lyon	2,898	56.04	28.54	7.94	1.04	0.07
Madison	27,152	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marshall	12,412	85.98	60.13	28.16	6.10	0.10
Mason	6,847	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Muhlenberg	12,357	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ohio	8,899	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Todd	4,569	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Trigg	5,215	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Union	5,710	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Webster	5,560	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 205: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Ballard	22	0.00	0.01	0.11	0.37	0.51
Caldwell	16	0.20	0.42	0.31	0.07	0.01
Calloway	40	0.03	0.19	0.38	0.23	0.16
Carlisle	16	0.00	0.02	0.18	0.41	0.39
Christian	83	0.43	0.39	0.16	0.02	0.00
Crittenden	11	0.18	0.41	0.33	0.08	0.01
Daviess	162	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.01
Fulton	15	0.00	0.06	0.25	0.39	0.29
Graves	57	0.01	0.06	0.28	0.39	0.27
Hancock	82	0.94	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Henderson	165	0.36	0.38	0.19	0.03	0.03
Hickman	24	0.00	0.04	0.22	0.41	0.33
Hopkins	99	0.40	0.39	0.18	0.03	0.00
Livingston	51	0.02	0.13	0.36	0.32	0.17
Logan	45	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Lyon	33	0.11	0.35	0.37	0.12	0.04
Marshall	125	0.01	0.10	0.32	0.31	0.26
McCracken	147	0.00	0.02	0.15	0.37	0.45
McLean	19	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.01
Muhlenberg	89	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Ohio	102	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.00
Todd	20	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Trigg	28	0.20	0.42	0.31	0.07	0.01
Union	51	0.19	0.41	0.30	0.06	0.03
Webster	59	0.36	0.39	0.20	0.03	0.02

Table 206: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Ballard	300	534	568
Caldwell	425	4	3
Calloway	678	113	181
Carlisle	225	765	303
Christian	969	7	2
Crittenden	417	3	1
Daviess	840	42	147
Fulton	265	744	363
Graves	791	949	1,408
Hancock	284	2	1
Henderson	722	40	140
Hickman	268	788	330
Hopkins	760	61	225
Livingston	343	52	58
Logan	763	5	1
Lyon	358	20	25
Madison	589	330	211
Marshall	598	1,145	934
Mason	311	11	36
Muhlenberg	716	13	34
Ohio	773	6	1
Todd	427	3	1
Trigg	627	5	1
Union	464	148	579
Webster	460	23	78

Table 207: Waste Water Pipeline Damage
Counties	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
	Bridges	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Ballard	25	0.33	0.10	0.07	0.12	0.38
Caldwell	84	0.93	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.04
Calloway	36	0.75	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.14
Carlisle	15	0.16	0.09	0.09	0.17	0.49
Christian	202	0.97	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Crittenden	19	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Daviess	233	0.86	0.02	0.01	0.10	0.01
Fulton	18	0.17	0.11	0.09	0.18	0.45
Graves	122	0.40	0.11	0.08	0.12	0.29
Hancock	64	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Henderson	171	0.82	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.10
Hickman	22	0.23	0.11	0.12	0.19	0.36
Hopkins	207	0.89	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.04
Livingston	30	0.84	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.08
Logan	33	0.97	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Lyon	49	0.94	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.00
Marshall	90	0.46	0.09	0.07	0.11	0.27
McCracken	80	0.32	0.08	0.07	0.17	0.37
McLean	64	0.85	0.02	0.01	0.11	0.01
Muhlenberg	127	0.91	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.00
Ohio	190	0.92	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.01
Todd	22	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Trigg	38	0.97	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Union	114	0.71	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.22
Webster	118	0.81	0.02	0.00	0.05	0.12

Table 208: Highway Bridge Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Ballard	25	43.66	48.30	51.16	53.08	61.64
Caldwell	84	94.87	95.56	95.75	95.87	96.34
Calloway	36	80.56	82.69	83.59	84.11	86.38
Carlisle	15	27.03	31.97	35.49	38.07	49.69
Christian	202	98.60	99.32	99.53	99.58	99.75
Crittenden	19	98.09	98.33	98.43	98.47	98.67
Daviess	233	87.79	88.35	88.68	89.62	94.92
Fulton	18	29.21	34.68	38.51	41.17	53.23
Graves	122	51.79	56.95	60.06	61.86	69.57
Hancock	64	99.11	99.51	99.67	99.70	99.81
Henderson	171	83.86	84.50	84.75	85.37	88.80
Hickman	22	35.71	41.92	46.60	49.32	61.11
Hopkins	207	92.05	93.13	93.49	93.84	95.61
Livingston	30	87.43	88.78	89.31	89.72	91.57
Logan	33	98.76	99.38	99.60	99.64	99.77
Lyon	49	97.83	99.09	99.24	99.32	99.66
Madison	90	55.47	59.77	62.42	64.12	71.63
Marshall	80	41.12	45.08	47.83	50.12	60.88
Mason	64	86.98	87.66	88.03	89.04	94.75
Muhlenberg	127	92.91	93.79	94.19	94.72	97.58
Ohio	190	92.99	93.50	93.75	94.28	97.17
Todd	22	99.00	99.44	99.63	99.66	99.79
Trigg	38	98.06	98.34	98.42	98.46	98.63
Union	114	76.04	77.63	77.82	78.15	79.80
Webster	118	83.04	83.59	83.83	84.39	87.47

 Table 209: Highway Bridge Functionality

Mississippi – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 82 counties in the State of Mississippi. Mississippi is approximately 47,700 square miles and is bordered by Tennessee to the north, the Gulf of Mexico to the south, Alabama to the east, and Arkansas and Louisiana to the west. For the purposes of this analysis, 25 critical counties have been identified in the northern portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 25 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document.

- Alcorn
- Benton
- Bolivar
- Calhoun
- Chickasaw
- Coahoma
- Desoto

- Grenada
- Itawamba
- Lafayette
- Lee
- Marshall
- Monroe
- Panola

- Pontotoc
- Prentiss
- Quitman
- Sunflower
- Tallahatchie
- Tate
- Tippah

The scenario consists of a magnitude 7.7 (M_w 7.7) earthquake along one segment of the NMSZ. The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for the middle fault in the proposed New Madrid Seismic Zone. Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northeastern, central, and southwestern. The worst-case NMSZ scenario for the State of Mississippi employs an event in the southwest segment of the eastern fault. The location of this scenario event is illustrated in Figure 8 .For more information on the hazard utilized in this scenario please reference Appendix I.



Figure 8: Scenario Fault Location for the State of Mississippi

349

- Tishomingo
- Tunica
- Union
- Yalobusha

The buildings in Mississippi are classified in two separate ways for damage estimates; by building use, termed "occupancy," and by structure type/material, termed "building type." The damage estimates shown indicate that less than 1% of the building stock in Mississippi experiences complete damage. This equates to roughly 7,300 completely damaged buildings in Mississippi. These completely damaged buildings are included in the roughly 39,000 at least moderately damaged buildings. Nearly 95% of all building collapses occurring to residential structures. In addition, about 89% of all at least moderate damage occurs in the 25 critical counties for Mississippi.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)							
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage				
Single Family	793,953	11,343	3,881				
Other Residential	212,185	26,741	3,094				
Commercial	8,062	705	190				
Industrial	1,657	466	112				
Other	1,478	127	23				
Total	1,017,335	39,382	7,300				

 Table 210: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Mississippi

Table 211: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the second seco	he 25 Critical Counties
---	-------------------------

General Occupancy Type Damage (25 Critical Counties)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	213,381	10,858	3,881			
Other Residential	55,294	23,214	3,094			
Commercial	2,060	627	190			
Industrial	944	445	112			
Other	349	99	23			
Total	272,028	35,243	7,300			

Wood construction is the most prevalent building type in Mississippi and sustains the most cases of complete damage. Nearly 46% of all instances of all complete damage, which is roughly 3,300 buildings, are experienced by wood frame structures. Unreinforced masonry (URM) construction and mobile homes (MH) also show high frequencies of complete damage and account for nearly all non-wood construction damage of this type. Concrete, steel, and reinforced masonry construction types represent considerably fewer cases of complete damage.

Of the 984 fire stations in the state, 81 (more than 8%) are estimated to experience at least moderate damage. Approximately 8-9% of most other essential facility types (schools, hospitals, and police stations) each sustain at least moderate damage. The only emergency operation center expected to sustain this level of damage is located in Desoto County.

Building Damage by Building Type							
Building Type	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete		
Wood	703,568	50807	7,092	189	3,335		
Steel	2,512	297	296	269	181		
Concrete	906	102	84	63	30		
Precast	955	104	113	78	40		
Reinforced Masonry	494	39	36	21	12		
Unreinforced Masonry	44,187	6104	3,553	1,531	764		
Mobile Home	133,149	27429	16,731	9,326	2,938		
Total	885,771	84,882	27,905	11,477	7,300		

Table 212: Building Damage by Building Type for the State of Mississippi

All non-functional facilities are located in the northern portion of the state. Of Mississippi's 123 hospitals, 89 are considered functional the day after the earthquake, and that number increases to 112 functional facilities after one week. Over 90% of all fire stations and police stations in Mississippi are estimated to remain functional the day after the earthquake, though all these functioning facilities are in the southern portion of the state. Most of Mississippi's northern counties are left without functioning facilities, and will likely experience diminished services in the immediate aftermath of an earthquake.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (State)							
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	Total No. FacilitiesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunction >50% at					
Hospitals	123	11	2	89			
Schools	1,281	110	10	1,130			
EOCs	37	1	0	35			
Police Stations	365	30	2	322			
Fire Stations	984	81	3	856			

Table 213: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the State of Mississippi⁸

⁸ For Tables 213-223 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (25 Critical Counties)							
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1			
Hospitals	27	11	2	0			
Schools	353	110	10	202			
EOCs	10	1	0	8			
Police Stations	121	30	2	78			
Fire Stations	294	81	3	166			

Table 214: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the 25 Critical Counties

Table 215: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments							
	Total No. Of BridgesAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctionali >50% at DayOf Bridges(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)Functionali >50% at Day						
25 Critical Counties	5,043	73	0	4,978			
Remaining Counties	11,893	0	0	11,893			
Total State	16,936	73	0	16,871			

Table 216: Airport Damage Assessments

Airport Damage Assessments						
	Total No. Of AirportAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctionality >50% at Day 1(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)					
25 Critical Counties	80	5	0	80		
Remaining Counties	176	0	0	176		
Total State	256	5	0	256		

As is the case with essential facilities, transportation lifelines also incur the most severe damage in northern Mississippi counties Roughly 75 of the 16,900 bridges, or less than 1% of all bridges, are estimated to incur at least moderate damage. Highway road segments connecting these damaged bridges are expected to incur slightly less damage than the bridges themselves, even in the counties with the most severe shaking. Highway segments are most generally defined as a section of highway between two end nodes. These end nodes are frequently highway bridges. At least moderate damage to highway bridges is characterized by moderate shear (diagonal) cracking of columns, spalling of cover concrete and shear keys, abutment movement less than two-inches, extensive cracking to shear keys, bent connection bolts, and moderate settlement of the bridge approaches. Furthermore, one port and five airports reach the at least moderate damage state and follow roughly the same damage distribution throughout the state as highway bridges. At least moderate damage to port facilities includes considerable ground settlement, derailment of port equipment, and damage to structural members. For airports, at least moderate damage is defined in the same manner as damage to other building types discussed previously.

Transportation System Damage						
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%	
Highway	Segments	2,425	0	0	2,425	
	Bridges	16,936	73	0	16,871	
	Tunnels	0	0	0	0	
Railways	Segments	2,376	0	0	2,376	
	Bridges	63	0	0	63	
	Tunnels	1	0	0	1	
	Facilities	76	0	0	76	
Bus	Facilities	40	0	0	40	
Light Rail	Segments	0	0	0	0	
-	Bridges	0	0	0	0	
	Facilities	0	0	0	0	
Ferry	Facilities	2	2	2	0	
Port	Facilities	222	1	0	222	
Airport	Facilities	256	5	0	256	
	Runways	205	0	0	205	

Table 217: Transportation System Damage for the State of Mississippi

Table 218: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments							
	Total No. of Potable Water Facilities	al No. of ble Water Damage Complete Damage Functionality cilities (Damage >50%)					
25 Critical Counties	3	0	0	3			
Remaining Counties	14	0	0	14			
Total State	17	0	0	17			

Table 219: Damage to Waste Water Facilities

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Waste Water Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1					
25 Critical Counties	630	102	0	347				
Remaining Counties	2,450	0	0	2,450				
Total State	3,080	102	0	2,797				

Utility lifelines show similar damage and functionality estimates to those of the transportation systems. Over 100 waste water and nearly 300 communication facilities incur at least moderate damage, while 24 electric power facilities reach the same damage state. There are no potable water facilities in the counties with the most intense shaking, and as a result, no potable water facilities are expected to reach the at least moderate damage. About 12% of all natural gas facilities in the critical counties incur at least moderate damage.

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Natural GasAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFFacilities(Damage > 50%)>							
25 Critical Counties	98	12	0	86				
Remaining Counties	317	0	0	317				
Total State	415	12	0	403				

Table 221: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Oil Facilities	Functionality >50% at Day 1						
25 Critical Counties	6	1	0	5				
Remaining Counties	99	0	0	99				
Total State	105	1	0	104				

Table 222: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Electric Power Facilities	Functionality >50% at Day 1						
25 Critical Counties	128	24	0	80				
Remaining Counties	620	0	0	620				
Total State	748	24	0	700				

Table 223: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments								
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1				
25 Critical Counties	2,553	290	0	2,553				
Remaining Counties	6,663	0	0	6,663				
Total State	9,216	290	0	9,216				

Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable water, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not included in the HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory, called local inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional oil pipelines are added to provide damage estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are composed of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at roughly 2,700 and 2,985, respectively. Local natural gas lines, however; show the greatest break and leak rates per length of pipe at

roughly 0.059 leaks/mile (1 leak every 17 miles) or 0.054 breaks/mile (roughly 1 break every 18.5 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of 2,583 leaks and 2,444 breaks over the combined length of 52,653 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off to nearly 42,000 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This is reduced to roughly 40,000 residences within a week, with all service restored after three months. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. Additional information on this formula is available in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual that accompanies the program. This period of time without water prevents thousands of people from remaining in their homes in the weeks and months following the earthquake. Electric power service shows similar trends, with over 32,600 residences without electric power the day after the earthquake, or over 3% of all state residences. Even a month after the earthquake, nearly 1,300 residences are still without power. All electric power lines in Mississippi are presumed to be above ground and less likely to incur damage from moderate ground shaking, unlike buried pipelines that are vulnerable to damage from liquefaction and ground deformation

Table 224: Pipeline Damage

Pipeline Damage								
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks					
Potable Water - Local	106,188	2,985	2,700					
Waste Water - Local	63,698	2,361	2,136					
Natural Gas - Regional	10,188	59	161					
Natural Gas - Local	42,465	2,524	2,283					
Oil - Regional	3,488	8	16					

Table 225: Utility Service Interruptions

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service									
	No. Households Day 1 Day 3 Day 7 Day 30 Day 90								
Potable Water	1 0/6 /3/	41,790	40,256	39,752	28,749	0			
Electric Power	1,046,434	32,601	18,416	6,452	1,276	44			

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county. The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as

discussed in footnote (8) and employed in the preceding damage tables for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Desoto County, Mississippi 204 Highway Bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 8:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 25 at least moderately damaged highway bridges
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of 56 at least moderately damaged highway bridges

In the case of Desoto County, Mississippi, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a higher estimate of damage as opposed to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (8). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Mississippi are estimated to incur less damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges for the 25 critical counties in Mississippi shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 300 at least moderately damaged highway bridges
- Total number of at least moderately damaged highway bridges according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 73 at least moderately damaged highway bridges

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces greater damage when summed for the 25 critical counties. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix. The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Mississippi. There tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage levels for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Alcorn						
Single Family	8,816	2,152	247	28	5	11,248
Other Residential	962	763	613	243	38	2,619
Commercial	66	29	12	1	0	108
Industrial	14	7	5	1	0	27
Other	4	2	1	0	0	7
Benton						
Single Family	1,120	1,023	209	41	30	2,423
Other Residential	8	67	278	285	53	691
Commercial	0	1	3	2	1	7
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bolivar						
Single Family	8,309	968	75	3	0	9,355
Other Residential	907	606	393	195	35	2,136
Commercial	68	32	15	4	1	120
Industrial	3	1	1	0	0	5
Other	10	4	2	1	0	17
Calhoun						
Single Family	4,301	501	39	1	0	4,842
Other Residential	532	425	237	6	0	1,200
Commercial	16	7	3	0	0	26
Industrial	14	6	3	0	0	23
Other	3	1	0	0	0	4
Chickasaw						
Single Family	4,295	500	39	1	0	4,835
Other Residential	939	758	424	10	0	2,131
Commercial	28	12	5	0	0	45
Industrial	11	5	3	0	0	19
Other	8	3	1	0	0	12
Coahoma						
Single Family	6,613	770	60	2	0	7,445
Other Residential	436	221	231	342	63	1,293
Commercial	20	20	18	13	4	75
Industrial	1	1	2	3	1	8
Other	3	2	1	1	0	7
Desoto						
Single Family	13,432	15,658	4,780	743	2,713	37,326
Other Residential	128	240	649	1,091	1,320	3,428
Commercial	1	10	67	107	130	315
Industrial	0	2	12	28	49	91
Other	4	5	8	10	13	40

Table 226: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Grenada						
Single Family	6,070	707	55	2	0	6,834
Other Residential	629	449	315	204	37	1,634
Commercial	49	22	10	2	1	84
Industrial	17	9	6	2	0	34
Other	4	2	1	0	0	7
Itawamba						
Single Family	6,357	740	58	2	0	7,157
Other Residential	906	761	428	10	0	2,105
Commercial	15	6	3	0	0	24
Industrial	2	1	0	0	0	3
Other	17	6	2	0	0	25
Lafayette						
Single Family	5,322	3,135	581	103	21	9,162
Other Residential	784	850	1,123	854	141	3,752
Commercial	4	20	52	37	9	122
Industrial	5	20	111	155	46	337
Other	2	3	8	6	1	20
Lee						
Single Family	20,288	2,363	184	7	0	22,842
Other Residential	2,671	1,805	974	24	0	5,474
Commercial	312	134	56	4	0	506
Industrial	99	46	25	2	0	172
Other	40	14	5	0	0	59
Marshall						
Single Family	3,915	3,575	728	142	158	8,518
Other Residential	72	374	1,437	1,466	295	3,644
Commercial	1	6	16	12	4	39
Industrial	0	1	4	6	2	13
Other	2	4	6	5	1	18
Monroe						
Single Family	10,075	1,174	91	3	0	11,343
Other Residential	1,522	1,190	661	16	0	3,389
Commercial	37	16	6	0	0	59
Industrial	11	5	3	0	0	19
Other	7	2	1	0	0	10
Panola				-	-	
Single Family	5,081	2,231	409	72	15	7,808
Other Residential	301	552	1,583	1,746	293	4,475
Commercial	18	21	24	17	5	85
Industrial	2	2	5	6	2	17
Other	4	3	4	3	1	15

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Pontotoc						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	6,784 1,059 27 18 5	864 860 12 8 2	67 481 5 4 1	2 12 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	7,717 2,412 44 30 8
Prentiss						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	6,380 812 27 7 9	1,072 626 12 3 4	84 345 5 2 1	3 8 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	7,539 1,791 44 12 14
Quitman						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	2,250 112 2 0 2	262 112 2 0 1	20 141 2 0 1	1 219 1 0 1	0 40 0 0	2,533 624 7 0 5
Sunflower					-	
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	6,748 383 45 6 9	618 185 16 2 4	48 120 7 1 3	2 70 1 0 2	0 13 0 0 0	7,416 771 69 9 18
Tallahatchie						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	3,022 221 5 0 5	352 244 5 0 3	27 312 5 1 3	1 485 3 0 2	0 90 1 0 1	3,402 1,352 19 1 14
Tate						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	3,050 87 1 0 1	2,785 257 7 2 2	567 831 20 8 5	110 837 14 8 4	443 238 10 7 3	6,955 2,250 52 25 15
Tippah		_	-		-	- •
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial	3,025 36 1 1	2,762 179 4 4	561 681 11 14	104 693 8 15	22 113 2 4	6,474 1,702 26 38
Other			۷	۷	U	0

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Tishomingo						
Single Family	5,900	948	74	3	0	6,925
Other Residential	745	596	332	8	0	1,681
Commercial	25	11	5	0	0	41
Industrial	9	4	2	0	0	15
Other	9	3	1	0	0	13
Tunica						
Single Family	630	576	117	22	454	1,799
Other Residential	25	78	257	259	263	882
Commercial	1	9	23	17	22	72
Industrial	0	0	0	1	1	2
Other	0	1	2	2	3	8
Union						
Single Family	5,647	1,757	262	41	20	7,727
Other Residential	605	514	575	357	62	2,113
Commercial	34	16	8	2	0	60
Industrial	26	12	6	0	0	44
Other	4	2	1	0	0	7
Yalobusha						
Single Family	3,260	459	36	1	0	3,756
Other Residential	770	622	345	8	0	1,745
Commercial	7	3	1	0	0	11
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

	T-4-1#	Da	Day 1 Day 3		Day 7		Day 30		Day 90		
Counties	of Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%
Alcorn	165	78	47.30	79	47.90	121	73.30	161	97.60	163	98.80
Benton	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bolivar	155	74	47.70	75	48.30	114	73.60	151	97.60	153	98.80
Calhoun	30	14	47.70	14	48.30	22	73.60	29	97.60	30	98.80
Chickasaw	84	40	47.70	41	48.30	62	73.60	82	97.60	83	98.80
Coahoma	195	33	17.00	34	17.50	78	39.80	169	86.60	182	93.20
Desoto	246	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.92	2	34.194	13.9
Grenada	156	74	47.70	75	48.30	115	73.60	152	97.60	154	98.80
Itawamba	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lafayette	204	1	0.40	1	0.50	6	2.70	62	30.20	119	58.10
Lee	50	24	47.70	24	48.30	37	73.60	49	97.60	49	98.80
Marshall	40	0	0.40	0	0.50	1	2.70	12	29.90	23	57.60
Monroe	144	69	47.70	70	48.30	106	73.60	141	97.60	142	98.80
Panola	182	16	8.70	16	9.00	39	21.25	106	58.40	138	75.65
Pontotoc	102	49	47.70	49	48.30	75	73.60	100	97.60	101	98.80
Prentiss	114	54	47.30	55	47.90	84	73.30	111	97.60	113	98.80
Quitman	36	6	17.00	6	17.50	14	39.80	31	86.60	34	93.20
Sunflower	160	76	47.70	77	48.30	118	73.60	156	97.60	158	98.80
Tallahatchie	77	13	17.00	13	17.50	31	39.80	67	86.60	72	93.20
Tate	76	0	0.30	0	0.30	2	2.00	17	22.60	33	43.60
Tippah	110	0	0.40	1	0.50	3	2.70	33	30.20	64	58.10
Tishomingo	48	23	47.30	23	47.90	35	73.30	47	97.60	47	98.80
Tunica	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Union	200	95	47.30	96	47.90	147	73.30	195	97.60	198	98.80
Yalobusha	85	40	47.30	41	47.90	62	73.30	83	97.60	84	98.80

 Table 227: Hospital Functionality

* Note: Discrepancies between the number of hospital beds and the percentage of beds may occur due to rounding.

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Alcorn	2	47.00
Benton	2	0.80
Bolivar	13	51.90
Calhoun	5	51.90
Chickasaw	4	51.90
Coahoma	7	51.90
Desoto	6	0.47
Grenada	2	51.90
Itawamba	4	51.90
Lafayette	3	0.90
Lee	7	51.90
Marshall	4	0.80
Monroe	5	51.90
Panola	6	9.33
Pontotoc	3	51.90
Prentiss	4	49.45
Quitman	5	51.90
Sunflower	8	67.73
Tallahatchie	7	51.90
Tate	4	0.80
Tippah	4	0.88
Tishomingo	6	49.45
Tunica	2	0.60
Union	4	47.00
Yalobusha	4	49.45

Table 228: Police Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Alcorn	17	38.86
Benton	5	0.80
Bolivar	25	51.90
Calhoun	8	51.90
Chickasaw	9	51.90
Coahoma	23	51.90
Desoto	35	0.43
Grenada	7	51.90
Itawamba	9	51.90
Lafayette	15	17.36
Lee	32	51.90
Marshall	16	0.80
Monroe	19	51.90
Panola	15	28.08
Pontotoc	13	51.90
Prentiss	15	48.75
Quitman	5	51.90
Sunflower	24	61.07
Tallahatchie	7	51.90
Tate	13	0.75
Tippah	12	0.89
Tishomingo	9	49.72
Tunica	6	0.60
Union	9	32.12
Yalobusha	5	48.96

Table 229: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Alcorn	15	37.78
Benton	6	0.80
Bolivar	14	51.90
Calhoun	8	51.90
Chickasaw	7	51.90
Coahoma	11	51.90
Desoto	19	0.53
Grenada	10	51.90
Itawamba	12	51.90
Lafayette	16	18.18
Lee	22	51.90
Marshall	9	0.80
Monroe	22	51.90
Panola	12	13.62
Pontotoc	12	50.68
Prentiss	14	48.05
Quitman	5	51.90
Sunflower	7	63.96
Tallahatchie	14	51.90
Tate	12	0.78
Tippah	9	0.88
Tishomingo	16	49.14
Tunica	2	0.60
Union	13	42.13
Yalobusha	7	51.20

Table 230: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Alcorn	172	81.93	95.17	96.89	99.60	99.90
Benton	23	78.40	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Bolivar	207	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Calhoun	66	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Chickasaw	78	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Coahoma	121	91.45	98.29	98.97	99.82	99.89
Desoto	250	61.43	82.88	87.71	97.35	99.49
Grenada	74	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Itawamba	55	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Lafayette	99	78.40	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Lee	219	93.22	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Marshall	114	75.16	92.04	94.63	99.16	99.83
Monroe	186	93.21	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Panola	112	78.36	93.95	96.05	99.46	99.89
Pontotoc	70	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Prentiss	45	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Quitman	60	88.27	97.27	98.30	99.77	99.90
Sunflower	128	95.62	99.27	99.58	99.90	99.90
Tallahatchie	60	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Tate	69	75.31	91.77	94.26	98.68	99.74
Tippah	55	78.47	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Tishomingo	65	93.22	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Tunica	117	74.39	89.06	91.16	95.68	99.15
Union	73	85.09	96.22	97.59	99.68	99.90
Yalobusha	35	89.39	97.64	98.55	99.80	99.90

 Table 231: Communication Functionality

Counties	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
Alcorn	14,224	0	0	0	0	0
Benton	2,999	0	0	0	0	0
Bolivar	13,776	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	6,019	0	0	0	0	0
Chickasaw	7,253	0	0	0	0	0
Coahoma	10,553	0	0	0	0	0
Desoto	38,792	37,257	37,066	36,588	26,460	0
Grenada	8,820	0	0	0	0	0
Itawamba	8,773	0	0	0	0	0
Lafayette	14,373	0	0	0	0	0
Lee	29,200	0	0	0	0	0
Marshall	12,163	151	0	0	0	0
Monroe	14,603	0	0	0	0	0
Panola	12,232	5	0	0	0	0
Pontotoc	10,097	0	0	0	0	0
Prentiss	9,821	0	0	0	0	0
Quitman	3,565	0	0	0	0	0
Sunflower	9,637	0	0	0	0	0
Tallahatchie	5,263	0	0	0	0	0
Tate	8,850	1,178	1	0	0	0
Tippah	8,108	0	0	0	0	0
Tishomingo	7,917	0	0	0	0	0
Tunica	3,258	3,199	3,189	3,164	2,289	0
Union	9,786	0	0	0	0	0
Yalobusha	5,260	0	0	0	0	0

Table 232: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Alcorn	1	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Benton	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bolivar	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Calhoun	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chickasaw	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Coahoma	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Desoto	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grenada	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Itawamba	1	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Lafayette	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lee	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marshall	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Monroe	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Panola	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pontotoc	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Prentiss	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Quitman	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sunflower	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tallahatchie	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tate	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tippah	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tishomingo	1	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Tunica	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Union	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yalobusha	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

 Table 233: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Alcorn	1,071	39	10
Benton	789	36	16
Bolivar	2,273	98	24
Calhoun	994	43	11
Chickasaw	891	38	10
Coahoma	1,724	131	33
Desoto	1,523	671	1,117
Grenada	972	42	10
Itawamba	1,174	6	2
Lafayette	1,230	53	13
Lee	1,472	49	12
Marshall	1,396	142	58
Monroe	1,651	36	9
Panola	1,584	156	39
Pontotoc	1,025	44	11
Prentiss	997	19	5
Quitman	690	59	15
Sunflower	2,010	66	16
Tallahatchie	1,661	71	18
Tate	888	92	81
Tippah	975	42	10
Tishomingo	1,122	48	12
Tunica	1,032	384	1,011
Union	908	40	12
Yalobusha	1,001	43	11

 Table 234: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
Alcorn	14,224	0	0	0	0	0
Benton	2,999	0	0	0	0	0
Bolivar	13,776	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	6,019	0	0	0	0	0
Chickasaw	7,253	0	0	0	0	0
Coahoma	10,553	0	0	0	0	0
Desoto	38,792	29,217	16,692	5,972	1,213	39
Grenada	8,820	0	0	0	0	0
Itawamba	8,773	0	0	0	0	0
Lafayette	14,373	0	0	0	0	0
Lee	29,200	0	0	0	0	0
Marshall	12,163	1,930	983	274	36	3
Monroe	14,603	0	0	0	0	0
Panola	12,232	0	0	0	0	0
Pontotoc	10,097	0	0	0	0	0
Prentiss	9,821	0	0	0	0	0
Quitman	3,565	0	0	0	0	0
Sunflower	9,637	0	0	0	0	0
Tallahatchie	5,263	0	0	0	0	0
Tate	8,850	1,454	741	206	27	2
Tippah	8,108	0	0	0	0	0
Tishomingo	7,917	0	0	0	0	0
Tunica	3,258	0	0	0	0	0
Union	9,786	0	0	0	0	0
Yalobusha	5,260	0	0	0	0	0

Table 235: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Counties	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Alcorn	21	21.17%	41.98%	29.89%	6.29%	0.64%
Benton	8	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Bolivar	37	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Calhoun	13	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Chickasaw	29	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Coahoma	28	44.59%	38.41%	14.83%	1.98%	0.17%
Desoto	90	7.48%	30.20%	40.69%	16.73%	4.88%
Grenada	31	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Itawamba	18	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Lafayette	26	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Lee	49	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Marshall	24	17.4%	40.2%	32.8%	8.3%	1.3%
Monroe	31	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Panola	38	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Pontotoc	25	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Prentiss	13	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Quitman	6	24.78%	41.43%	27.58%	5.63%	0.57%
Sunflower	24	59.7%	30.4%	9.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Tallahatchie	12	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Tate	27	16.03%	38.17%	32.36%	8.53%	4.89%
Tippah	17	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Tishomingo	25	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Tunica	16	18.35%	39.26%	28.68%	6.10%	7.59%
Union	12	39.91%	39.13%	17.84%	2.84%	0.26%
Yalobusha	10	40.92%	38.97%	17.19%	2.65%	0.24%

Table 236: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Alcorn	1,035	31	8
Benton	763	28	13
Bolivar	2,196	77	19
Calhoun	960	34	8
Chickasaw	861	30	8
Coahoma	1,666	104	26
Desoto	1,472	531	883
Grenada	939	33	8
Itawamba	1,134	5	1
Lafayette	1,189	42	10
Lee	1,422	39	10
Marshall	1,349	112	46
Monroe	1,596	28	7
Panola	1,531	124	31
Pontotoc	991	35	9
Prentiss	963	15	4
Quitman	667	47	12
Sunflower	1,942	52	13
Tallahatchie	1,604	56	14
Tate	858	72	64
Tippah	943	33	8
Tishomingo	1,085	38	10
Tunica	997	304	800
Union	877	31	9
Yalobusha	967	34	9

 Table 237: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Alcorn	234	90.34%	7.05%	1.24%	1.00%	0.36%
Benton	120	85.82%	5.20%	3.03%	3.40%	2.53%
Bolivar	286	97.01%	1.57%	0.67%	0.55%	0.18%
Calhoun	224	97.30%	2.03%	0.42%	0.21%	0.03%
Chickasaw	231	97.41%	1.94%	0.40%	0.20%	0.03%
Coahoma	112	85.66%	6.16%	3.39%	3.33%	1.43%
Desoto	204	62.86%	9.83%	6.02%	8.30%	12.97%
Grenada	171	88.68%	4.57%	2.63%	2.84%	1.26%
Itawamba	240	97.32%	1.99%	0.43%	0.22%	0.03%
Lafayette	263	89.19%	6.00%	1.74%	1.61%	1.43%
Lee	377	97.32%	1.95%	0.45%	0.23%	0.03%
Marshall	256	79.93%	6.96%	3.78%	4.36%	4.95%
Monroe	289	98.79%	0.90%	0.19%	0.10%	0.01%
Panola	251	82.63%	7.29%	4.01%	4.17%	1.87%
Pontotoc	164	96.21%	3.24%	0.34%	0.17%	0.02%
Prentiss	206	94.14%	5.16%	0.43%	0.22%	0.03%
Quitman	117	70.15%	11.43%	7.01%	7.73%	3.66%
Sunflower	189	94.24%	2.78%	1.28%	1.20%	0.47%
Tallahatchie	155	79.79%	7.92%	4.77%	5.23%	2.27%
Tate	157	72.14%	8.03%	4.43%	5.62%	9.75%
Tippah	175	88.18%	5.26%	2.77%	2.71%	1.06%
Tishomingo	138	95.24%	4.22%	0.33%	0.17%	0.02%
Tunica	63	65.80%	4.52%	2.60%	2.57%	24.48%
Union	242	89.20%	5.94%	1.88%	1.81%	1.14%
Yalobusha	179	96.68%	2.53%	0.49%	0.25%	0.03%

Table 238: Highway Bridge Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Alcorn	234	95.97	98.09	98.56	98.72	99.23
Benton	120	90.70	92.91	94.12	94.57	96.43
Bolivar	286	98.33	98.92	99.20	99.27	99.54
Calhoun	224	98.90	99.52	99.68	99.71	99.80
Chickasaw	231	98.94	99.53	99.69	99.71	99.81
Coahoma	112	91.32	93.88	95.23	95.69	97.42
Desoto	204	72.46	76.68	79.08	80.27	85.28
Grenada	171	92.93	94.84	95.88	96.27	97.75
Itawamba	240	98.90	99.51	99.68	99.70	99.80
Lafayette	263	94.23	96.23	96.91	97.15	98.04
Lee	377	98.87	99.48	99.65	99.69	99.80
Marshall	256	86.43	89.30	90.80	91.41	93.90
Monroe	289	99.46	99.73	99.80	99.81	99.86
Panola	251	89.36	92.39	93.97	94.55	96.73
Pontotoc	164	98.69	99.59	99.72	99.74	99.82
Prentiss	206	98.10	99.50	99.66	99.70	99.80
Quitman	117	81.01	85.94	88.69	89.77	93.84
Sunflower	189	96.69	97.76	98.27	98.43	99.05
Tallahatchie	155	87.25	90.65	92.54	93.25	95.98
Tate	157	79.78	83.10	84.87	85.70	89.13
Tippah	175	92.95	95.11	96.21	96.57	97.97
Tishomingo	138	98.47	99.60	99.72	99.75	99.83
Tunica	63	70.46	72.36	73.42	74.09	77.00
Union	242	94.23	96.27	97.00	97.26	98.23
Yalobusha	179	98.68	99.44	99.64	99.67	99.79

 Table 239: Highway Bridge Functionality

Missouri – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

This earthquake impact assessment includes the City of St. Louis and all 114 counties in the State of Missouri. Missouri is approximately 70,000 square miles and is bordered by Iowa to the north; Arkansas to the south; Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee to the east; and Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma to the west. For the purposes of this analysis, 46 critical counties have been identified in the southeastern portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 46 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document.

- Audrain
- Bollinger •
- Boone •
- **Butler** •
- Callaway •
- Cape Girardeau •
- Carter •
- Cole •
- Crawford •
- Dent •
- Douglas •
- Dunklin

- Franklin
- Gasconade
- Howell
- Iron •
- Jefferson •
- Lincoln •
- Madison •
- Maries •
- Miller •
- Mississippi •
- Montgomery
- New Madrid

- Oregon Osage
- Perry ٠
- Phelps
- Pike •
- •
- Pulaski
 - Reynolds
- Ripley •
- St. Charles •
- Ste. Genevieve .

- St. Francois
- St. Louis
- St. Louis City •
- Scott •
- Shannon •
- Stoddard
- Texas •
- Warren •
- Washington
- Wayne



Figure 9: Scenario Fault Location for the State of Missouri

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Missouri employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Fault. The scenario consists of a magnitude 7.7 (M_w7.7) earthquake event along the central segment of the presumed New Madrid Fault system.

Ozark • Pemiscot •

The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for the middle fault in the proposed New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ). Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northern, central and southern. The worst-case scenario for the State of Missouri, the critical counties in particular, is an event on the western fault line in the central segment. The location of this scenario event is illustrated in Figure 9. For more information on the hazard utilized in this scenario please reference Appendix I.

The NMSZ scenario produces thousands of damaged buildings in the State of Missouri. The damage estimates shown indicate that nearly 85,000 buildings in Missouri experience at least moderate damage, of which 37,000 of these buildings experience complete damage. Nearly 98% of all at least moderate damage and complete damage occurs to residential structures. Additionally, about 98% of all at least moderate damage occurs in the 46 critical counties.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	1,472,235	55,807	23,860			
Other Residential	272,089	26,748	12,179			
Commercial	20,433	1,560	651			
Industrial	2,872	226	80			
Other	2,916	226	121			
Total	1,770,545	84,567	36,891			

Table 240: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the State of Missouri

 Table 241: Damage by General Occupancy Type for the 46 Critical Counties

General Occupancy Type Damage (46 Critical Counties)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	781,203	55,195	23,860			
Other Residential	148,667	25,859	12,179			
Commercial	11,156	1,533	651			
Industrial	1,678	218	80			
Other	1,536	215	121			
Total	944,240	83,020	36,891			

Wood construction, the most prevalent building type in Missouri, sustains the most cases of complete damage. Approximately 15,000 wood frame buildings will experience complete damage, this equates to about 40% of all complete damage cases. Unreinforced masonry (URM) construction and mobile homes (MH) also show high frequencies of complete damage and account for about 58% of all complete damage cases. This damage state is identified by significant cracking to unreinforced masonry walls as well as some connection damage to column/beam joints in unreinforced masonry building. The

remaining building types show far less inventory throughout the state and thus experience a far lesser proportion of damage.

Building Damage by Building Type								
Building Type	3uilding Type None Slight Moderate Extensive Complet							
Wood	1,108,809	40,945	13,655	4,808	15,090			
Steel	6,800	601	360	109	298			
Concrete	2,166	156	70	27	84			
Precast	2,291	179	129	41	97			
Reinforced Masonry	1,493	121	77	20	69			
Unreinforced Masonry	317,999	34,151	11,730	3,929	11,686			
Mobile Home	149,399	20,868	8,177	4,544	9,567			
Total	1,588,957	97,021	34,198	13,478	36,891			

Table 242: Building Damage by Building Type for the State of Missouri

Table 243: Essential Facilities D	Damage & Functionality	ty for the State of Missouri ⁹

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (State)						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1		
Hospitals	160	8	3	123		
Schools	2,817	185	85	2,530		
EOCs	33	7	4	25		
Police Stations	654	61	32	587		
Fire Stations	1,399	116	48	1,264		

Table 244: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the 46 Critical Counties

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (46 Critical Counties)					
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Complete Damage Damage (Damage >50%) (Damage >50%)		Functionality >50% at Day 1	
Hospitals	79	8	3	42	
Schools	1,435	185	85	1,148	
EOCs	17	7	4	9	
Police Stations	326	61	32	259	
Fire Stations	647	116	48	512	

Of the 1,399 fire stations in the state, 116 (more than 8%) are estimated to experience at least moderate damage. Approximately 8-10% of most other essential facility types

⁹ For Tables 243-253 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

(schools, hospitals and police stations) each sustain at least moderate damage. Several emergency operation centers are expected to sustain this level of damage since they are located in the portion of the state which experiences the most severe shaking. All at least moderated damage of essential facilities is confined to the 46 critical counties.

All non-functional facilities are located in the southeastern portion of the state. Additionally, numerous hospitals in the St. Louis metropolitan area are not functional the first week after the earthquake. Of Missouri's 160 hospitals, 123 are considered functional the day after the earthquake and that number increases to 152 functional facilities after one week. Roughly 90% of all fire stations and police stations in Missouri are estimated to remain functional the day after the earthquake, though all these functioning facilities are in the northern and western portions of the state. Most of Missouri's southeastern counties are left without functioning facilities and will likely experience diminished services in the immediate aftermath of an earthquake.

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments							
	Total No. Of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1			
46 Critical Counties	7,803	1,363	659	6,447			
Remaining Counties	13,962	0	0	13,962			
Total State	21,765	1,363	659	20,409			

Table 245: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Table 246: Airport Damage Assessment

Airport Damage Assessments						
	Total No. Of Airports	Total No.At Least ModerateCompleteOf AirportsDamageDamage(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)				
46 Critical Counties	208	33	5	182		
Remaining Counties	350	0	0	350		
Total State	558	33	5	532		

As is the case with essential facilities, transportation lifelines located in southeastern Missouri Counties incur the most severe damage. Roughly 1,360 of the 21,800 bridges, or 6% of all bridges, are estimated to incur at least moderate damage. Of the 1,360 damaged bridges, 659 are expected to experience complete damage. Highway road segments connecting these damaged bridges are expected to incur slightly less damage than the bridges themselves, even in these counties with the most severe shaking. Highway segments are most generally defined as a section of highway between two end nodes. These end nodes are frequently highway bridges. At least moderate damage to highway bridges is characterized by moderate shear (diagonal) cracking of columns, spalling of cover concrete and shear keys, abutment movement less than two-inches, extensive cracking to shear keys, bent connection bolts and moderate settlement of the bridge approaches.

Furthermore, 27% of all ports and 16% of all airports reach the at least moderate damage state and follow roughly the same damage distribution throughout the state as highway bridges. At least moderate damage to port facilities includes considerable ground settlement, derailment of port equipment and damage to structural members. For airports, at least moderate damage is defined in the same manner as damage to other building types discussed previously. The lack of functionality of many transportation lifelines in southeastern Missouri will make the movement of people and supplies difficult in the days immediately following the earthquake.

Transportation System Damage						
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%	
Highway	Segments Bridges Tunnels	4,186 21,765 0	0 1,363 0	0 659 0	4,185 20,409 0	
Railways	Segments Bridges Tunnels Facilities	3,487 200 12 125	0 2 0 24	0 0 0	3,487 198 12 109	
Bus	Facilities	72	5	1	69	
Light Rail	Segments Bridges Facilities	2 0 17	0 0 17	0 0 17	2 0 0	
Ferry	Facilities	8	8	8	0	
Port	Facilities	230	49	0	205	
Airport	Facilities Runways	558 440	33 0	5 0	532 440	

Table 247: Transportation System Damage for the State of Missouri

 Table 248: Damage to Potable Water Facilities

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Potable Water FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage (Damage >50%)Functio >50% at					
46 Critical Counties	3,413	758	48	2,756		
Remaining Counties	5,186	0	0	5,186		
Total State	8,599	758	48	7,942		

Utility lifelines show similar damage and functionality estimates to those of the transportation systems. Over 750 of all potable water facilities are moderately or more severely damaged while 48 incur complete damage. Additionally 88 waste water facilities, 1,573 communication facilities, and 96 electric power facilities incur at least moderate damage. Additionally, 65 natural gas facilities, or about 54% of all natural gas facilities located in the critical counties, experience at least moderate damage.

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Waste Water Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%) Complete Damage (Damage >50%)			
46 Critical Counties	626	88	8	505		
Remaining Counties	686	0	0	686		
Total State	1,312	88	8	1,191		

Table 249: Damage to Waste Water Facilities

Table 250: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments					
	Total No. of Natural Gas Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%) Complete Damage		Functionality >50% at Day 1	
46 Critical Counties	117	63	6	54	
Remaining Counties	237	0	0	237	
Total State	354	63	9	291	

Table 251: Damage to Oil Facilities

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments					
	Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)			Functionality >50% at Day 1	
46 Critical Counties	52	8	0	44	
Remaining Counties	maining Counties 67 0		0 67		
Total State	119	8	0	111	

Table 252: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Electric Power Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	east Moderate Damage amage >50%)			
46 Critical Counties	426	96	7	309		
Remaining Counties	980	0	0	980		
Total State	1,406	96	7	1,289		

Table 253: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments						
	Total No. of Communication Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Least Moderate Damage Damage >50%)			
46 Critical Counties	9,232	1,573	104	8,367		
Remaining Counties	11,640	0	0	11,640		
Total State	20,872	1,573	104	20,007		

Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable water, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not included in the HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory, called local inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional oil pipelines are added to provide damage estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are composed of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of both breaks and leaks at roughly 20,400 and 15,000, respectively. Local natural gas lines, however, show the greatest break and leak rates per length of pipe at roughly 0.19 leaks/mile (1 leak every 5.2 miles) or 0.26 breaks/mile (roughly 1 break every 3.8 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of approximately 12,950 leaks and 18,000 breaks over the combined length of 70,400 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off for over 146,000 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This is reduced to roughly 80,000 residences within a week and nearly 38,000 customers are still without service after three months. Additionally, all service interruptions occur in the 46 critical counties. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. Additional information on this formula is available in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual that accompanies the program. This period of time without water prevents thousands of people from remaining in their homes in the weeks and months following the earthquake. Electric power service shows similar trends, with over 100,000 service outages the day after the earthquake, or nearly 5% of all state residences without power. Even a month after the earthquake nearly 13,000 residences are still without power. All electric power lines are presumed to be above ground and less likely to incur damage from moderate ground shaking unlike buried pipelines that are vulnerable to damage from liquefaction and ground deformation.

Pipeline Damage					
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks		
Potable Water – Local	165,831	15,052	20,409		
Waste Water – Local	99,499	11,905	16,142		
Natural Gas – Regional	4,087	223	754		
Natural Gas – Local	66,312	12,726	17,255		
Oil – Regional	6,413	60	163		

 Table 254: Pipeline Damage

Table 255: Utility Service Interruptions

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service						
	No. Households	Day 1	Day 3	Day 7	Day 30	Day 90
Potable Water	2,194,594	146,368	115,391	79,848	77,818	38,426
Electric Power		100,141	70,720	39,499	12,955	121

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county. The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (9) and employed in the preceding damage tables for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Jefferson County, Missouri 91 waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 9:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 0 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of 11 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

In the case of Jefferson County, Missouri, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a higher estimate of damage as opposed to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (9). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Missouri are estimated to incur less damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities for the 46 critical counties in Missouri shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 108 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 88 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces more damage. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Missouri. There tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage levels for a county.
Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Audrain						
Single Family	7,077	77	6	0	0	7,160
Other Residential	1,056	90	11	0	0	1,157
Commercial	65	2	0	0	0	67
Industrial	17	0	0	0	0	17
Other	18	1	0	0	0	19
Bollinger						
Single Family	1,385	972	427	165	227	3,176
Other Residential	191	200	287	291	239	1,208
Commercial	6	4	4	2	1	17
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	2	1	2	1	0	6
Boone						
Single Family	28,969	317	26	0	0	29,312
Other Residential	8,202	504	61	0	0	8,767
Commercial	582	15	2	0	0	599
Industrial	46	1	0	0	0	47
Other	75	2	0	0	0	77
Butler						
Single Family	952	3,811	2,412	492	2,951	10,618
Other Residential	35	135	147	507	2,101	2,925
Commercial	0	0	7	38	159	204
Industrial	0	0	0	3	20	23
Other	0	2	2	4	26	34
Callaway						
Single Family	9,316	102	8	0	0	9,426
Other Residential	3,465	332	41	0	0	3,838
Commercial	57	1	0	0	0	58
Industrial	4	0	0	0	0	4
Other	9	0	0	0	0	9
Cape Girardeau						
Single Family	8,056	5,565	2,142	906	887	17,556
Other Residential	771	812	942	729	271	3,525
Commercial	24	50	118	84	35	311
Industrial	2	3	9	9	4	27
Other	7	5	8	6	2	28
Carter						
Single Family	974	387	133	50	37	1,581
Other Residential	102	129	252	224	56	763
Commercial	8	4	3	2	1	18
Industrial	2	1	1	0	0	4
Other	3	1	1	0	0	5

Table 256: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Cole						
Single Family	17,752	194	16	0	0	17,962
Other Residential	2,630	140	17	0	0	2,787
Commercial	264	7	1	0	0	272
Industrial	22	1	0	0	0	23
Other	186	5	1	0	0	192
Crawford						
Single Family	6,392	70	6	0	0	6,468
Other Residential	1,757	180	22	0	0	1,959
Commercial	53	1	0	0	0	54
Industrial	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	6	0	0	0	0	6
Dent	-	-	-	-		-
Single Family	3.785	41	3	0	0	3.829
Other Residential	1 337	131	16	Ő	Ő	1 484
Commercial	45	1	0	Ő	ů 0	46
Industrial	8	0	0	0	0	8
Other	12	0	0	0	0	12
Douglos	12	0	0	0	0	12
Single Femily	3 344	37	3	0	0	3 38/
Single Failing	1,070	100	13	0	0	1 102
Other Residential	24	109	15	0	0	1,192
Commercial	24	1	0	0	0	23
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	Z	0	0	0	0	2
Dunklin	124	792	1 (20	1 202	4 (77	0.505
Single Family	124	182	1,030	1,292	4,077	8,505
Other Residential	2	13	58	123	1,/3/	1,933
Commercial	0	0	0	l	73	74
Industrial	0	0	0	0	9	9
Other	0	0	0	0	7	7
Franklin				_	_	
Single Family	24,800	271	22	0	0	25,093
Other Residential	5,489	521	64	0	0	6,074
Commercial	231	6	1	0	0	238
Industrial	63	2	0	0	0	65
Other	28	1	0	0	0	29
Gasconade						
Single Family	4,596	50	4	0	0	4,650
Other Residential	1,229	121	15	0	0	1,365
Commercial	32	1	0	0	0	33
Industrial	12	0	0	0	0	12
Other	7	0	0	0	0	7
Howell						
Single Family	8,520	93	8	0	0	8,621
Other Residential	3,058	304	38	0	0	3,400
Commercial	112	3	0	0	0	115
Industrial	11	0	0	0	0	11
Other	11	0	0	0	0	11

Iron						
Single Family	2,290	393	73	4	0	2,760
Other Residential	437	369	211	5	0	1,022
Commercial	13	6	2	0	0	21
Industrial	3	1	1	0	0	5
Other	5	2	1	0	0	8
Jefferson						
Single Family	44,179	4,922	899	46	124	50,170
Other Residential	9,447	2,807	1,274	29	62	13,619
Commercial	297	83	33	2	1	416
Industrial	45	8	4	0	0	57
Other	36	8	3	0	0	47
Lincoln			-			
Single Family	9.452	103	8	0	0	9,563
Other Residential	3 483	356	44	0	0 0	3 883
Commercial	55	1	0	0	0	56
Industrial	5	0	0	0	0	5
Other	3	0	0	0	0	3
Madican	5	0	0	0	0	5
Niadison Single Femile	2 564	408	02	5	37	3 106
Single Family	2,304	490	92	5	12	3,190
Other Residential	444	536	204	5	12	1,025
Commercial	19	0 2	3	0	0	50 10
Industrial	6	3	1	0	0	10
Other	5	2	1	0	0	8
Maries	0.201	25	2	0	0	2.249
Single Family	2,321	25	2	0	0	2,348
Other Residential	844	85	11	0	0	940
Commercial	15	0	0	0	0	15
Industrial	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	6	0	0	0	0	6
Miller			_		_	
Single Family	6,238	68	5	0	0	6,311
Other Residential	1,877	185	23	0	0	2,085
Commercial	54	1	0	0	0	55
Industrial	9	0	0	0	0	9
Other	8	0	0	0	0	8
Mississippi						
Single Family	310	1,191	874	224	925	3,524
Other Residential	18	86	187	171	192	654
Commercial	0	2	7	5	7	21
Industrial	0	0	1	1	1	3
Other	0	1	2	2	2	7
Montgomery						
Single Family	3,684	40	3	0	0	3,727
Other Residential	851	86	11	0	0	948
Commercial	31	1	0	0	0	32
Industrial	7	0	0	0	0	7
Other	9	0	0	0	0	9

New Madrid						
Single Family	26	424	1,226	854	2,154	4,684
Other Residential	2	31	161	295	1,040	1,529
Commercial	0	0	4	10	33	47
Industrial	0	0	0	1	4	5
Other	0	0	0	1	7	8
Onegon	0	0	0	I	7	0
Circle Femile	2 211	255	46	4	12	2 620
Single Family	2,511	233	40	4	15	2,029
Other Residential	007	284	150	4	0	1,051
Commercial	22	3	l	0	0	26
Industrial	3	0	0	0	0	3
Other	7	1	0	0	0	8
Osage						
Single Family	3,962	43	3	0	0	4,008
Other Residential	637	63	8	0	0	708
Commercial	20	1	0	0	0	21
Industrial	30	1	0	0	0	31
Other	12	0	0	0	0	12
Ozark		0	0	Ū	Ū.	
Single Femily	2 803	31	2	0	0	2 836
Other Desidential	2,005	121	15	0	0	1 283
	1,147	121	15	0	0	1,203
Commercial	18	0	0	0	0	18
Industrial	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	5	0	0	0	0	5
Pemiscot						
Single Family	21	352	1,259	938	2,214	4,784
Other Residential	0	9	59	128	1,007	1,203
Commercial	0	0	1	4	37	42
Industrial	0	0	0	0	3	3
Other	0	0	1	3	39	43
Perrv						
Single Family	4.122	784	145	12	33	5.096
Other Residential	479	376	213	6	6	1 080
Commorcial	46	20	8	1	1	76
Industrial	10	5	2	0	0	17
nidustriai	10	5	2	0	0	20
Other	15	5	2	0	0	20
Phelps	0.106	100	0	0	0	0.014
Single Family	9,106	100	8	0	0	9,214
Other Residential	2,887	254	31	0	0	3,172
Commercial	109	3	0	0	0	112
Industrial	5	0	0	0	0	5
Other	23	1	0	0	0	24
Pike						
Single Family	4,424	48	4	0	0	4,476
Other Residential	1,076	107	13	0	0	1,196
Commercial	64	2	0	0	0	66
Industrial	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	14	0	0	0	0	14

Pulaski						
Single Family	7,902	86	7	0	0	7,995
Other Residential	3,063	267	33	0	0	3,363
Commercial	111	3	0	0	0	114
Industrial	6	0	0	0	0	6
Other	34	1	0	0	0	35
Reynolds						
Single Family	1,823	313	59	5	20	2,220
Other Residential	294	257	148	4	6	709
Commercial	7	3	1	0	0	11
Industrial	3	2	1	0	0	6
Other	3	1	0	0	0	4
Rinley	-					
Single Family	483	1.200	956	317	309	3.265
Other Residential	9	78	421	636	497	1 641
Commercial	1	3	11	9	6	30
Industrial	0	1	3	5	4	13
Other	0	1	1	1	1	15
Saint Charles	0	1	1	I	1	-
Same Charles	76 /8/	836	67	1	0	77 388
Single Failing	6 500	524	64	1	0	7 1 8 7
Other Residential	762	10	04 2	0	0	792
Commercial	702	19	2	0	0	165
Industrial	94	5	0	0	0	97
Other	97	3	0	0	0	100
Saint Francois	11.667	1 200	255	12	0	12 222
Single Family	11,007	1,388	255	13	0	15,525
Other Residential	2,305	1,010	516	12	0	3,843
Commercial	100	36	14	l	0	151
Industrial	9	3	2	0	0	14
Other	9	3	1	0	0	13
Saint Louis City						
Single Family	47,742	8,032	1,498	78	2,350	59,700
Other Residential	19,113	3,372	696	35	1,821	25,037
Commercial	910	386	159	12	157	1,624
Industrial	138	63	34	3	21	259
Other	310	63	23	1	13	410
Saint Louis						
Single Family	269,941	20,609	3,660	184	344	294,738
Other Residential	10,908	1,163	273	12	37	12,393
Commercial	3,963	626	235	16	4	4,844
Industrial	663	85	40	3	2	793
Other	147	41	15	1	9	213
Sainte Genevieve						
Single Family	4,183	717	134	7	0	5,041
Other Residential	565	481	276	7	0	1,329
Commercial	29	12	5	0	0	46
Industrial	10	5	3	0	0	18
Other	3	1	0	0	0	4

Scott						
Single Family	1,593	3,205	2,111	805	2,483	10,197
Other Residential	49	192	557	757	1,010	2,565
Commercial	1	5	22	32	56	116
Industrial	0	1	3	5	7	16
Other	0	2	3	5	10	20
Shannon						
Single Family	1,667	286	53	3	0	2,009
Other Residential	298	261	151	4	0	714
Commercial	6	3	1	0	0	10
Industrial	1	1	0	0	0	2
Other	2	1	0	0	0	3
Stoddard						
Single Family	95	615	1,910	1,632	3,790	8,042
Other Residential	1	6	69	207	1,490	1,773
Commercial	0	0	1	5	79	85
Industrial	0	0	0	0	5	5
Other	0	0	0	0	2	2
Texas			_	_	_	
Single Family	5,488	60	5	0	0	5,553
Other Residential	2,123	214	26	0	0	2,363
Commercial	57	1	0	0	0	58
Industrial	14	0	0	0	0	14
Other	17	0	0	0	0	17
Warren			_			
Single Family	7,136	78	6	0	0	7,220
Other Residential	1,902	193	24	0	0	2,119
Commercial	44	l	0	0	0	45
Industrial	1	0	0	0	0	10
Other	12	0	0	0	0	12
Washington	2.024	202	<i>c</i> 0	4	0	4 200
Single Family	3,834	383	69	4	0	4,290
Other Residential	2,364	/50	350	8	0	3,472
Commercial	18	6	2	0	0	26
Industrial	3	1	1	0	0	5
Other	13	3	I	0	0	17
Wayne	1.014	1.0.47	792	229	29.4	2 5 5 5
Single Family	1,014	1,247	182	228	284	3,333
Other Residential	239	280	5/0	/04	281	2,380
Commercial	11	0	5	5	3	28 5
Industrial	2	1	1	1	0	5
Other	2	2	1	1	2	8

	Total	Day	y 1	Day	y 3	Da	у 7	Day	y 30	Day	y 90
Counties	# of Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%
Audrain	201	194	96.5	194	96.5	200	99.5	201	100.0	201	100.0
Bollinger	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boone	1,227	1,183	96.4	1,184	96.5	1,218	99.3	1,226	99.9	1,226	99.9
Butler	483	23	4.8	26	5.4	116	24.0	372	77.0	403	83.4
Callaway	557	537	96.4	538	96.6	553	99.3	556	99.8	556	99.8
Саре											
Girardeau	545	185	33.9	190	34.9	379	69.5	528	96.9	531	97.4
Carter	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cole	302	291	96.4	291	96.4	300	99.3	302	100.0	302	100.0
Crawford	75	72	96.0	72	96.0	74	98.7	75	100.0	75	100.0
Dent	59	57	96.6	57	96.6	59	100.0	59	100.0	59	100.0
Douglas	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dunklin	118	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	14	11.9
Franklin	187	180	96.3	180	96.3	186	99.5	187	100.0	187	100.0
Gasconade	44	42	95.5	42	95.5	44	100.0	44	100.0	44	100.0
Howell	162	156	96.3	156	96.3	161	99.4	162	100.0	162	100.0
Iron	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jefferson	236	113	47.9	114	48.3	174	73.7	230	97.5	233	98.7
Lincoln	72	69	95.8	69	95.8	71	98.6	72	100.0	72	100.0
Madison	159	131	82.4	131	82.4	153	96.2	159	100.0	159	100.0
Maries	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Miller	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Montgomery	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Madrid	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oregon	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Osage	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ozark	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pemiscot	209	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.9	42	20.1
Perry	64	30	46.9	31	48.4	47	73.4	62	96.9	63	98.4
Phelps	240	231	96.3	232	96.7	238	99.2	240	100.0	240	100.0
Pike	45	43	95.6	43	95.6	45	100.0	45	100.0	45	100.0
Pulaski	75	72	96.0	72	96.0	74	98.7	75	100.0	75	100.0
Reynolds	159	75	47.2	76	47.8	116	73.0	154	96.9	156	98.1
Ripley Saint	30	3	10.0	3	10.0	11	36.7	26	86.7	27	90.0
Charles	743	716	964	717	96 5	738	993	742	99 9	742	99 9
Sainte	715	/10	20.1	/1/	70.5	750	<i>))</i> .5	712	,,,,	/12	,,,,
Genevieve	47	22	46.8	23	48.9	35	74.5	46	97.9	46	97.9
Saint											
Francois	464	297	64.0	299	64.4	381	82.1	456	98.3	460	99.1
Saint Louis											
County &											
Saint Louis	0 170	5.000	61.0	5 005	62.2	6 170	70.2	7 724	04.5	7 705	05.2
	ð,170 199	5,062	01.9	5,095	02.3	0,479	19.2	1,134	94.0	1,195	93.3 60.1
Scott	100 N/A	ð NI/A	4.3 N/A	ð NI/A	4.3 N/A	38 N/A	20.2 N/A	121 N/A	04.4	13U N/A	09.1 N/A
Shannon	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A	1N/A

Table 257: Hospital Functionality

Stoddard	50	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.0	13	26.0
Texas	66	64	97.0	64	97.0	66	100.0	66	100.0	66	100.0
Warren	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Washington	40	19	47.5	19	47.5	29	72.5	39	97.5	40	100.0
Wayne	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Audrain	4	94.10
Bollinger	2	7.00
Boone	8	94.10
Butler	3	0.00
Callaway	5	94.10
Cape Girardeau	5	29.08
Carter	2	51.40
Cole	8	94.10
Crawford	5	94.10
Dent	2	94.10
Douglas	2	94.10
Dunklin	10	0.00
Franklin	7	94.10
Gasconade	4	94.10
Howell	5	94.10
Iron	3	51.90
Jefferson	14	57.93
Lincoln	7	94.10
Madison	2	69.80
Maries	3	94.10
Miller	4	94.10
Mississippi	4	2.28
Montgomery	7	94.10
New Madrid	11	0.00
Oregon	3	65.63
Osage	2	94.10
Ozark	2	94.10
Pemiscot	8	0.00
Perry	2	51.40
Phelps	6	94.10
Pike	4	94.10
Pulaski	7	94.10
Reynolds	2	51.40
Ripley	2	2.90
Saint Charles	9	94.10
Saint Francois	11	63.41
Sainte Genevieve	3	49.63
Saint Louis City	7	48.01
Saint Louis	95	67.82
Scott	8	2.28
Shannon	4	51.90
Stoddard	8	0.00
Texas	5	94.10
Warren	5	94.10
Washington	3	51.90
Wayne	3	23.70

Table 258: Police Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Audrain	15	94.10
Bollinger	8	19.25
Boone	57	94.10
Butler	20	0.00
Callaway	23	94.10
Cape Girardeau	37	24.13
Carter	6	26.15
Cole	34	94.10
Crawford	13	94.10
Dent	9	94.10
Douglas	3	94.10
Dunklin	21	0.00
Franklin	58	94.10
Gasconade	11	94.10
Howell	19	94.10
Iron	9	51.90
Jefferson	71	64.38
Lincoln	20	94.10
Madison	5	68.90
Maries	5	94.10
Miller	14	94.10
Mississippi	10	2.26
Montgomery	8	94.10
New Madrid	15	0.00
Oregon	8	60.33
Osage	11	94.10
Ozark	4	94.10
Pemiscot	19	0.00
Perry	10	51.45
Phelps	21	94.10
	13	94.10
Pulaski Dama da	23	94.10
Reynolds	8 10	51.53
Kipley Soint Charles	10	2.70
Saint Charles	98 27	94.10 58.12
Saint Francois	27	51.12
Sainte Genevieve	9	51.14 47.97
Saint Louis City	139	47.57
Sant Louis Scott	421	2.55
Shannon	<u>م</u>	51 90
Stoddard	+ 20	0.00
Texas	14	94 10
Warren	11	94.10
Washington	14	69 99
Wavne	7	38.54

Table 259: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality at Day 1 (%)
Audrain	7	94.10
Bollinger	10	27.30
Boone	27	94.10
Butler	19	0.00
Callaway	19	94.10
Cape Girardeau	18	30.06
Carter	7	22.51
Cole	19	94.10
Crawford	10	94.10
Dent	5	94.10
Douglas	9	94.10
Dunklin	12	0.00
Franklin	26	94.10
Gasconade	11	94.10
Howell	18	94.10
Iron	7	51.90
Jefferson	32	69.04
Lincoln	10	94.10
Madison	3	68.30
Maries	5	94.10
Miller	19	94.10
Mississippi	5	2.28
Montgomery	8	94.10
New Madrid	10	0.00
Oregon	8	65.61
Osage	7	94.10
Ozark	14	94.10
Pemiscot	5	0.00
Perry	6	50.60
Phelps	9	94.10
Pike	8	94.10
Pulaski	12	94.10
Reynolds	7	51.47
Ripley	12	3.73
Saint Charles	33	94.10
Saint Francois	16	67.73
Sainte Genevieve	9	51.14
Saint Louis	85	75.01
Saint Louis City	27	48.63
Scott	14	1.26
Shannon	5	51.90
Stoddard	9	0.00
Texas	12	94.10
Warren	10	94.10
Washington	11	74.92
Wayne	12	17.57

Table 260: Fire Station Functionality

Counting	# of	At Day 1	At Day 3	At Day 7	At Day 30	At Day 90
Counties	Facilities	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Audrain	208	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Bollinger	81	62.33	83.83	88.57	97.87	99.59
Boone	499	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Butler	189	42.34	62.62	70.66	89.57	98.11
Callaway	231	99.75	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Cape Girardeau	325	66.04	86.11	90.03	97.66	99.55
Carter	40	76.75	93.04	95.40	99.38	99.88
Cole	284	99.78	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Crawford	121	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Dent	63	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Douglas	48	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Dunklin	160	25.87	37.51	46.56	72.65	95.12
Franklin	300	96.44	99.41	99.66	99.90	99.90
Gasconade	94	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Howell	171	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Iron	77	82.82	95.46	97.09	99.62	99.90
Jefferson	541	93.18	98.88	99.38	99.89	99.90
Lincoln	150	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Madison	61	71.94	90.24	93.41	99.04	99.80
Maries	55	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Miller	128	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Mississippi	64	56.33	74.37	78.54	88.78	97.96
Montgomery	131	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
New Madrid	161	29.09	42.43	51.05	75.38	95.60
Oregon	55	84.32	95.96	97.42	99.66	99.90
Osage	100	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Ozark	44	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Pemiscot	125	25.40	37.18	46.48	73.08	95.22
Perry	111	77.74	93.19	95.29	98.87	99.78
Phelps	172	93.82	99.00	99.45	99.90	99.90
Pike	137	99.80	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Pulaski	136	99.69	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Reynolds	63	78.40	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Ripley	64	54.48	76.79	82.98	95.91	99.23
Saint Charles	566	99.59	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Saint Francois	198	87.59	97.04	98.15	99.75	99.90
Sainte	107	01.80	08 43	00.06	00.81	00.80
Soint Louis	1614	91.89	90.43	99.00	99.81	99.89
Saint Louis Saint Louis City	755	93.34	99.22	99.33	99.88 00.47	99.90
Saint Louis City	187	92.74 54.64	90.40 74 31	70.38	99.47	99.81
Shonnon	187	03 20	74.31	79.38	91.07	98.38
Staddard	+0 162	32 74	70.70 A8 84	58 73	99.90 87 37	99.90
Tavas	134	93 20	98 00	90.23	99 00	90.03
Warren	125	99 59	99.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Washington	82	93.20	98.90	99.20	99.90	99.90
Wayne	65	53.15	74 95	81 58	95.64	90.16
wayne	05	55.15	14.70	01.30	73.04	77.10

 Table 261: Communication Facility Functionality

Garrettan	# of	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
Counties	Households	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Audrain	9,844	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bollinger	4,576	22.68	4.63	0.00	0.00	0.00
Boone	53,094	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Butler	16,718	98.79	98.68	98.44	95.36	0.00
Callaway	14,416	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cape Girardeau	26,980	40.30	28.74	4.63	0.00	0.00
Carter	2,378	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cole	27,040	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	8,858	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dent	5,982	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Douglas	5,201	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dunklin	13,411	99.87	99.86	99.84	99.66	94.97
Franklin	34,945	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gasconade	6,171	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howell	14,762	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Iron	4,197	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jefferson	71,499	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lincoln	13,851	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	4,711	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maries	3,519	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Miller	9,284	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mississippi	5,383	99.83	99.81	99.76	98.77	0.00
Montgomery	4,775	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	7,824	99.90	99.88	99.87	99.72	94.85
Oregon	4,263	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Osage	4,922	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ozark	3,950	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pemiscot	7,855	99.86	99.85	99.82	99.50	58.93
Perry	6,904	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Phelps	15,683	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pike	6,451	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pulaski	13,433	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reynolds	2,721	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ripley	5,416	15.27	1.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Charles	101,663	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Francois	6,586	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sainte	20 702	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Soint Louis	20,795	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Louis	147.076	35.84	18 51	0.00	0.00	0.00
Scott	147,070	99.85	99.83	99.81	99.43	11 15
Shannon	3 3 1 9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stoddard	12 064	99.88	99.88	99.87	99 78	98.61
Tevas	9 378	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warren	9 185	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington	2,105 8 406	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wavne	5 551	41 97	28 30	1 50	0.00	0.00

Table 262: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# Facilities	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Audrain	40	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bollinger	23	0.08	0.31	0.41	0.17	0.04
Boone	137	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Butler	86	0.02	0.13	0.36	0.31	0.18
Callaway	91	0.95	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cape Girardeau	119	0.10	0.34	0.38	0.13	0.05
Carter	28	0.15	0.39	0.35	0.10	0.01
Cole	92	0.96	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	87	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Dent	36	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Douglas	33	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dunklin	63	0.00	0.03	0.17	0.34	0.46
Franklin	212	0.65	0.27	0.07	0.01	0.00
Gasconade	42	0.90	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Howell	81	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Iron	51	0.30	0.41	0.24	0.05	0.00
Jefferson	277	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Lincoln	126	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	33	0.16	0.39	0.35	0.10	0.01
Maries	27	0.90	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Miller	116	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mississinni	43	0.06	0.05	0.35	0.15	0.00
Montgomery	49	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	78	0.01	0.05	0.22	0.31	0.00
Oregon	28	0.35	0.00	0.21	0.04	0.00
Oregon	41	0.90	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Ozark	66	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pemiscot	68	0.00	0.03	0.17	0.36	0.45
Perry	40	0.20	0.42	0.31	0.07	0.01
Phelps	94	0.53	0.35	0.10	0.01	0.00
Pike	45	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pulaski	88	0.95	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Revnolds	50	0.20	0.42	0.31	0.07	0.01
Ripley	32	0.08	0.27	0.39	0.19	0.08
Saint Charles	140	0.94	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Francois	117	0.38	0.39	0.19	0.03	0.00
Sainte	C 4	0.42	0.20	0.16	0.02	0.01
Genevieve	54	0.43	0.38	0.16	0.02	0.01
Saint Louis	87	0.67	0.25	0.07	0.01	0.00
Saint Louis City	2	0.90	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Scott	84	0.05	0.23	0.36	0.18	0.18
Shannon	33	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Stoddard	90	0.00	0.05	0.22	0.37	0.36
Texas	62	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Warren	72	0.92	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.00
Washington	73	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Wayne	77	0.04	0.23	0.42	0.25	0.07

 Table 263: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Audrain	1,468	8	2
Bollinger	1,072	103	116
Boone	2,080	11	3
Butler	1,717	847	1,905
Callaway	1,866	10	3
Cape Girardeau	1,628	379	238
Carter	812	11	26
Cole	1,217	7	2
Crawford	1,732	9	2
Dent	1,412	8	2
Douglas	1,574	9	2
Dunklin	1,543	1,383	3,254
Franklin	2,927	16	4
Gasconade	1,107	6	2
Howell	2,116	12	3
Iron	832	5	1
Jefferson	2,821	17	12
Lincoln	1,586	9	2
Madison	789	12	30
Maries	967	5	1
Miller	1,471	8	2
Mississippi	821	929	1,647
Montgomery	1,187	6	2
New Madrid	1,394	2,078	3,149
Oregon	1,308	10	12
Osage	1,090	6	1
Ozark	1,465	8	2
Pemiscot	1,195	923	2,483
Perry	1,111	20	12
Phelps	1,661	9	2
Pike	1,231	7	2
Pulaski	1,426	8	2
Reynolds	1,239	10	14
Ripley	1,112	75	100
Saint Charles	2,372	13	3
Saint Francois	1,468	8	2
Sainte Genevieve	1,022	6	1
Saint Louis	4,989	30	19
Saint Louis City	1,160	46	162
Scott	1,123	2,908	2,314
Shannon	1,637	9	2
Stoddard	1,922	3,417	4,260
Texas	2,389	13	3
Warren	1,116	6	2
Washington	1,632	9	2
Wayne	1,362	72	210

 Table 264: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Counting	# of	At Day 1	At Day 3	At Day 7	At Day 30	At Day 90
Counties	Households	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Audrain	9,844	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bollinger	4,576	72.95	39.27	12.08	1.75	0.11
Boone	53,094	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Butler	16,718	86.54	62.17	31.94	8.63	0.10
Callaway	14,416	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cape Girardeau	26,980	65.41	33.59	9.76	1.50	0.09
Carter	2,378	40.79	20.77	5.80	0.76	0.04
Cole	27,040	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	8,858	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dent	5,982	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Douglas	5,201	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dunklin	13,411	94.16	82.72	60.70	23.32	0.10
Franklin	34,945	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gasconade	6,171	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howell	14.762	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Iron	4,197	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jefferson	71,499	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lincoln	13.851	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	4.711	21.21	10.80	3.01	0.38	0.02
Maries	3.519	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Miller	9.284	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mississippi	5,383	77.30	49.21	25.82	9.77	0.09
Montgomerv	4,775	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	7,824	91.95	76.69	52.72	19.75	0.10
Oregon	4,263	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Osage	4,922	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ozark	3,950	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pemiscot	7,855	94.25	82.39	59.20	22.00	0.10
Perry	6,904	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Phelps	15,683	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pike	6,451	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pulaski	13,433	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reynolds	2,721	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ripley	5,416	62.85	38.52	14.27	2.44	0.07
Saint Charles	101,663	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Francois	6,586	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sainte Genevieve	20,793	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Louis	404,312	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Louis City	147,076	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Scott	15,626	78.90	50.65	25.07	8.40	0.10
Shannon	3,319	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stoddard	12,064	92.66	78.71	54.79	20.04	0.10
Texas	9,378	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warren	9,185	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington	8,406	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wayne	5,551	79.64	49.58	19.62	3.68	0.11

Table 265: Households without Electric Service

Counties	# of Facilities	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Audrain	12	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bollinger	1	0.09	0.33	0.41	0.15	0.02
Boone	71	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Butler	9	0.02	0.15	0.36	0.29	0.18
Callaway	37	0.94	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cape Girardeau	19	0.11	0.35	0.38	0.12	0.04
Carter	3	0.12	0.36	0.38	0.12	0.02
Cole	23	0.95	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	8	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Dent	5	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Douglas	1	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dunklin	9	0.00	0.05	0.21	0.33	0.42
Franklin	55	0.69	0.24	0.06	0.01	0.00
Gasconade	9	0.90	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Howell	4	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Iron	6	0.25	0.41	0.28	0.06	0.01
Jefferson	91	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Lincoln	19	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	5	0.15	0.39	0.35	0.10	0.01
Maries	2	0.90	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Miller	16	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mississippi	6	0.07	0.28	0.34	0.12	0.18
Montgomery	10	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	11	0.00	0.05	0.19	0.31	0.45
Oregon	2	0.35	0.40	0.21	0.04	0.00
Osage	4	0.90	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Ozark	1	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pemiscot	5	0.00	0.02	0.14	0.35	0.49
Perry	5	0.19	0.42	0.30	0.06	0.02
Phelps	19	0.56	0.33	0.10	0.01	0.00
Pike	7	0.97	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pulaski	13	0.93	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reynolds	6	0.20	0.42	0.31	0.07	0.01
Ripley	4	0.07	0.26	0.38	0.19	0.09
Saint Charles	19	0.95	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Francois	13	0.41	0.39	0.17	0.03	0.00
Sainte Genevieve	6	0.40	0.39	0.18	0.03	0.00
Saint Louis	6	0.40	0.39	0.18	0.03	0.00
Saint Louis City	2	0.50	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.01
Scott	9	0.07	0.27	0.37	0.16	0.14
Shannon	4	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Stoddard	11	0.01	0.07	0.24	0.34	0.34
Texas	6	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Warren	18	0.94	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington	7	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Wayne	6	0.04	0.22	0.41	0.26	0.07

 Table 266: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Audrain	881	6	2
Bollinger	643	82	92
Boone	1,248	9	2
Butler	1,030	670	1,507
Callaway	1,119	8	2
Cape Girardeau	977	299	188
Carter	487	8	20
Cole	730	5	1
Crawford	1,039	7	2
Dent	847	6	2
Douglas	945	7	2
Dunklin	926	1,093	2,574
Franklin	1,756	13	3
Gasconade	664	5	1
Howell	1,270	9	2
Iron	499	4	1
Jefferson	1,692	14	9
Lincoln	951	7	2
Madison	473	9	24
Maries	580	4	1
Miller	882	6	2
Mississippi	492	735	1,303
Montgomery	712	5	1
New Madrid	837	1,643	2,490
Oregon	785	8	10
Osage	654	5	1
Ozark	879	6	2
Pemiscot	717	730	1,964
Perry	667	16	10
Phelps	996	7	2
Pike	739	5	1
Pulaski	856	6	2
Reynolds	743	8	11
Ripley	667	59	79
Saint Charles	1,423	10	3
Saint Francois	881	6	2
Sainte Genevieve	613	4	1
Saint Louis	2,994	24	15
Saint Louis City	696	37	128
Scott	674	2,300	1,830
Shannon	982	7	2
Stoddard	1,153	2,703	3,369
Texas	1,433	10	3
Warren	670	5	1
Washington	979	7	2
Wayne	817	57	166

Table 267: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# Bridges	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Audrain	287	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bollinger	117	0.73	0.06	0.04	0.08	0.09
Boone	256	0.97	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Butler	251	0.25	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.43
Callaway	273	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cape Girardeau	323	0.80	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.05
Carter	30	0.87	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02
Cole	154	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crawford	101	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dent	73	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Douglas	67	0.97	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Dunklin	206	0.11	0.05	0.05	0.14	0.64
Franklin	273	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gasconade	127	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Howell	145	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Iron	105	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jefferson	330	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lincoln	161	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	103	0.94	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.00
Maries	64	0.96	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Miller	113	0.97	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Mississippi	91	0.54	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.28
Montgomery	162	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
New Madrid	274	0.14	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.62
Oregon	76	0.91	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
Osage	83	0.98	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
Ozark	81	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pemiscot	192	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.14	0.56
Perry	118	0.95	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02
Pheips	11/	0.97	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
r ike Dulocki	74	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Powolds	74	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rinley	114	0.50	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Charles	216	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Francois	143	0.97	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Sainte Genevieve	79	0.97	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
Saint Louis	705	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Saint Louis City	240	0.91	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.04
Scott	172	0.49	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.28
Shannon	50	0.97	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stoddard	412	0.20	0.07	0.07	0.14	0.52
Texas	148	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Warren	110	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington	146	0.98	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wayne	188	0.61	0.14	0.06	0.09	0.09

Table 268: Highway Bridge Damage

Counting	No.	At Day 1	At Day 3	At Day 7	At Day 30	At Day 90
Counties	Bridges	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Audrain	287	99.42	99.67	99.77	99.78	99.84
Bollinger	117	78.86	81.66	83.35	84.35	88.72
Boone	256	98.69	99.31	99.55	99.60	99.76
Butler	251	34.96	39.40	42.64	45.00	55.82
Callaway	273	99.45	99.66	99.75	99.78	99.84
Cape Girardeau	323	86.33	88.87	90.09	90.72	93.40
Carter	30	91.40	93.22	94.20	94.67	96.53
Cole	154	99.49	99.71	99.79	99.80	99.85
Crawford	101	99.27	99.60	99.72	99.75	99.83
Dent	73	99.06	99.50	99.67	99.70	99.80
Douglas	67	98.73	99.35	99.58	99.63	99.77
Dunklin	206	18.36	21.28	23.59	25.92	37.06
Franklin	273	99.26	99.59	99.71	99.74	99.82
Gasconade	127	98.98	99.44	99.63	99.66	99.79
Howell	145	99.17	99.53	99.68	99.71	99.81
Iron	105	99.14	99.56	99.69	99.72	99.82
Jefferson	330	99.23	99.52	99.64	99.67	99.78
Lincoln	161	99.41	99.67	99.76	99.78	99.84
Madison	103	97.54	98.84	99.00	99.08	99.34
Maries	64	98.29	99.08	99.41	99.48	99.70
Miller	113	98.64	99.29	99.54	99.59	99.75
Mississippi	91	61.77	65.00	66.93	68.05	72.84
Montgomery	162	99.57	99.74	99.81	99.82	99.86
New Madrid	274	21.48	24.48	26.76	28.95	39.44
Oregon	76	97.01	99.11	99.30	99.38	99.63
Osage	83	98.85	99.36	99.58	99.63	99.77
Ozark	81	98.99	99.48	99.66	99.69	99.80
Pemiscot	192	24.87	28.35	30.98	33.30	44.24
Perry	118	96.49	97.10	97.25	97.34	97.66
Phelps	117	98.58	99.17	99.43	99.49	99.69
Pike	181	99.16	99.54	99.69	99.72	99.81
Pulaski	74	99.31	99.56	99.70	99.73	99.81
Reynolds	72	98.93	99.29	99.41	99.46	99.68
Ripley	114	64.57	69.37	72.43	74.07	81.06
Saint Charles	216	99.48	99.70	99.78	99.80	99.85
Saint Francois	143	98.59	99.31	99.55	99.60	99.75
Sainte Genevieve	79	98.41	98.80	98.93	99.01	99.38
Saint Louis	705	98.94	99.23	99.34	99.39	99.64
Saint Louis City	240	91.37	91.63	91.86	92.34	95.00
Scott	172	56.48	59.76	62.05	63.61	70.63
Shannon	50	98.94	99.52	99.68	99.71	99.81
Stoddard	412	28.59	32.54	35.42	37.73	48.36
Texas	148	99.07	99.51	99.67	99.70	99.81
Warren	110	99.56	99.74	99.81	99.82	99.86
Washington	146	99.24	99.61	99.73	99.75	99.83
Wayne	188	73.88	79.29	81.79	83.03	88.18

 Table 269: Highway Bridge Functionality

Tennessee – New Madrid Seismic Zone Event

This earthquake impact assessment includes all 95 counties in the State of Tennessee. Tennessee is approximately 42,100 square miles and is bordered by Kentucky and Virginia to the north, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia to the south, Missouri and Arkansas to the west, and North Carolina to the east. For the purposes of this analysis, 37 critical counties have been identified in the western portion of the state where shaking is anticipated to be most intense. These 37 counties are the focus of much of the damage assessment included within this document.

- Benton
- Carroll
- Cheatham
- Chester
- Crockett
- Davidson
- Decatur
- Dickson
- Dyer
- Fayette

- Gibson
- Giles
- Hardeman
- Hardin
- Haywood
- Henderson
- Henry
- Hickman
- Houston
- Humphreys

- Lake

- Obion
- Perry

- Robertson
- Shelby
- Stewart
- Tipton
- Wayne
- Weaklev
- Williamson



Figure 10: Scenario Fault Location for the State of Tennessee

The earthquake impact assessment for the State of Tennessee employs one scenario event along the New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ). The ground motions used to represent this seismic event were developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). The scenario

- Lauderdale Lawrence
 - - Lewis
 - McNairy
 - Madison
 - Maury
 - Montgomery

consists of a magnitude 7.7 (M_w 7.7) earthquake along one segment of the NMSZ. Each fault line is presumed to consist of three fault segments; northern, central and southern. The worst-case scenario for the State of Tennessee, and the critical counties in particular, is an event on an eastern fault line associated with the southern segment. The location of this scenario event is illustrated in Figure 10. For more information on the hazard utilized in this scenario please reference Appendix I.

The NMSZ scenario produces thousands of damaged buildings in the State of Tennessee. The damage estimates shown indicate that more than 8% of the building stock, roughly 176,000 buildings, experience at least moderate damage. This includes complete damages, which equate to about 4% of the building stock, or roughly 82,000 buildings in Tennessee. Nearly 95% of all cases of complete damage occur with residential buildings. This occupancy type also accounts for nearly 99% of at least moderate damage throughout the state. All of the complete damage cases are contained in the 37 critical counties for the State of Tennessee.

General Occupancy Type Damage (State level)							
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage				
Single Family	1,720,196	142,729	58,255				
Other Residential	330,518	31,012	19,340				
Commercial	20,582	1,882	3,461				
Industrial	3,553	286	520				
Other	2,337	170	331				
Total	2,077,186	176,079	81,907				

Table 271: Damage l	y General Occupanc	y Type for the 37	V Critical Counties
---------------------	--------------------	-------------------	---------------------

General Occupancy Type Damage (37 Critical Counties)						
General Occupancy Type	Total No. Buildings	Moderate to Severe Damage	Complete Damage			
Single Family	811,843	142,431	58,255			
Other Residential	117,912	28,995	19,340			
Commercial	11,113	1,853	3,461			
Industrial	1,467	278	520			
Other	1,245	167	331			
Total	943,580	173,724	81,907			

Wood construction, the most prevalent building type in Tennessee, sustains the most cases of complete damage. Nearly 43% of all instances of complete damage, roughly 34,900 buildings, occur with wood frame structures for the State of Tennessee. Unreinforced masonry (URM) construction and mobile homes (MH) also show high frequencies of collapse and account for nearly 54% of all building collapses. The remaining building types show far less inventory throughout the state and thus experience a far lesser proportion of damage.

Building Damage by Building Type							
Building Type	None Slight Moderate Extensive Comple						
Wood	1,255,670	180,779	112,188	19,319	34,888		
Steel	6,045	222	171	353	1,610		
Concrete	1,786	39	68	135	417		
Precast	1,934	57	66	139	497		
Reinforced Masonry	1,125	15	36	84	312		
Unreinforced Masonry	138,979	7,893	7,597	11,117	29,385		
Mobile Home	199,367	25,289	13,577	11,229	14,797		
Total	1,604,906	214,294	133,703	42,376	81,907		

Table 272: Building Damage by Building Type for the State of Tennessee

Of the 1,110 fire stations in the state, 256 (more than 23%) are estimated to experience at least moderate damage. Approximately 25-30% of most other essential facility types (schools, hospitals and police stations) each sustain at least moderate damage. In addition, 404 of the 2,309 schools and 117 fire stations are estimated to collapse. The Tennessee inventory does not specify any locations for emergency operations centers and thus no damage can be determined for this type of essential facility.

All non-functional facilities are located in the western portion of the state. Of Tennessee's 180 hospitals, 132 are considered functional the day after the earthquake and that number increases to 137 functional facilities after one week. Roughly 70% of all fire stations and police stations in Tennessee are estimated to remain functional the day after the earthquake, though all these functioning facilities are in the central and eastern portions of the state. Most of Tennessee's western counties are left without functioning facilities and will likely experience diminished services in the immediate aftermath of an earthquake.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (State)						
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	Total No.At Least ModerateCompleteFacilitiesDamageDamage(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)				
Hospitals	180	43	8	132		
Schools	2,309	602	404	1,674		
EOCs	0	0	0	0		
Police Stations	423	124	78	289		
Fire Stations	1,110	256	117	815		

 Table 273: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the State of Tennessee¹⁰

¹⁰ For Tables 273-283 the following method is used to determine the number of facilities in a damage category. HAZUS-MH MR2 assigns each facility a probability of reaching a specific damage level (at least moderate, complete, etc.). In order to provide quantities of facilities at various damage levels, all those facilities that experience a damage probability of 50% or greater for a given damage level are counted as 'damaged'. Therefore, the facilities that are not 50% likely to incur damage at a specific damage level are deemed 'undamaged'.

Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality (37 Critical Counties)					
Essential Facility Type	Total No. Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1	
Hospitals	81	43	8	33	
Schools	1,106	602	404	471	
EOCs	0	0	0	0	
Police Stations	209	124	78	75	
Fire Stations	482	256	117	186	

Table 274: Essential Facilities Damage & Functionality for the 37 Critical Counties

Table 275: Highway Bridge Damage Assessments

Highway Bridge Damage Assessments					
	Total No.At Least ModerateCompleteOf BridgesDamageDamage(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)				
37 Critical Counties	3,815	877	330	2,937	
Remaining Counties	3,400	1	0	3,400	
Total State	7,215	878	330	6,337	

Table 276: Airport Damage Assessments

Airport Damage Assessments						
	Total No. Of Airports	Total No. Of AirportsAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctional 				
37 Critical Counties	141	50	2	104		
Remaining Counties	174	0	0	174		
Total State	315	50	2	278		

As is the case with essential facilities, western Tennessee counties incur the most severe damage. Roughly 900 of the 7,200, or more than 12% of all bridges, are estimated to incur at least moderate damage. Of the nearly 900 damaged bridges, 330 are expected to collapse. Highway road segments connecting these damaged bridges are expected to incur slightly less damage than the bridges themselves, even in the counties with the most severe shaking. Highway segments are most generally defined as a section of highway between two end nodes. These end nodes are frequently highway bridges. At least moderate damage to highway bridges is characterized by moderate shear (diagonal) cracking of columns, spalling of cover concrete and shear keys, abutment movement less than two-inches, extensive cracking to shear keys, bent connection bolts, and moderate settlement of the bridge approaches.

Furthermore, 81 ports, 54 railway facilities, and 50 airports reach at least moderate damage state and follow roughly the same damage distribution throughout the state as highway bridges. At least moderate damage to port facilities includes considerable ground settlement, derailment of port equipment, and damage to structural members. For airports, at least moderate damage is defined in the same manner as damage to other

building types discussed previously. The lack of functionality of many transportation lifelines in western Tennessee will make the movement of people and supplies difficult in the days immediately following the earthquake.

Transportation System Damage						
Transportation System	Туре	Quantity	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage>50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality at Day 1 < 50%	
Highway	Segments	4,682	0	0	4,682	
	Bridges	7,215	878	330	6,337	
	Tunnels	5	0	0	5	
Railways	Segments	2,936	0	0	2,936	
-	Bridges	151	4	0	147	
	Tunnels	15	0	0	15	
	Facilities	129	54	1	78	
Bus	Facilities	51	7	0	46	
Light Rail	Segments	35	0	0	35	
	Bridges	0	0	0	0	
	Facilities	25	25	25	0	
Ferry	Facilities	6	6	6	0	
Port	Facilities	200	81	7	129	
Airport	Facilities	315	50	2	278	
	Runways	206	0	0	206	

Table 277: Transportation System Damage for the State of Tennessee

Table 278:	Damage to	Potable	Water	Facilities
1 4010 2701	Duningetto	1 otubie	·· · ·	I activites

Potable Water Facilities Damage Assessments					
	Total No. of Potable WaterAt Least Moderate DamageComplete DamageFunctionalitiesFacilities(Damage >50%)(Damage >50%)>50% at Damage				
37 Critical Counties	30	9	1	21	
Remaining Counties	68	0	0	68	
Total State	98	9	1	89	

Table 279:	Damage to	Waste	Water	Facilities

Waste Water Facilities Damage Assessments					
	Total No. of Waste Water Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)	Complete Damage (Damage >50%)	Functionality >50% at Day 1	
37 Critical Counties	742	375	14	246	
Remaining Counties	1,204	0	0	1,204	
Total State	1,946	375	14	1,450	

Utility lifelines show similar damage and functionality estimates to those of the transportation systems. Approximately 380 waste water facilities, 3,500 communication facilities and 65 electric power facilities incur at least moderate damage. Furthermore, 14

waste water facilities and 48 communication facilities are expected to experience complete damage. At least moderated damage to potable water, waste water, communication, electric power, natural gas, and oil facilities are contained within the 37 critical counties. Approximately 49% of all natural gas facilities in the critical counties incur at least moderate damage.

Natural Gas Facilities Damage Assessments					
	Total No. of Natural Gas FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functionality >50% at Day				
37 Critical Counties	121	59	1	62	
Remaining Counties	62	0	0	62	
Total State	183	59	1	124	

 Table 280: Damage to Natural Gas Facilities

	Table 2	81: Da	mage to	Oil E	acilities
--	---------	--------	---------	-------	-----------

Oil Facilities Damage Assessments									
Total No. of Oil FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage > 50%)Complete Damage (Damage > 50%)Functional >50% at Da									
37 Critical Counties	65	32	0	33					
Remaining Counties	56	0	0	56					
Total State	121	32	0	89					

Table 282: Damage to Electric Power Facilities

Electric Power Facilities Damage Assessments										
Total No. of Electric Power FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage >50%Funct >50%										
37 Critical Counties	153	63	0	61						
Remaining Counties	275	0	0	275						
Total State	428	63	0	336						

Table 283: Damage to Communication Facilities

Communication Damage Assessments										
Total No. of Communication FacilitiesAt Least Moderate Damage (Damage >50%)Complete Damage >50%Fur >50%										
37 Critical Counties	6,969	3,468	48	5,018						
Remaining Counties	9,161	0	0	9,161						
Total State	16,130	3,468	48	14,179						

Pipeline damage is estimated for local potable water, waste water and natural gas systems. Major transmission pipelines for natural gas are added from HSIP 2007 data. Oil pipelines are not included in the HAZUS-MH MR2 default inventory, called local

inventory in HAZUS-MH MR2, though regional oil pipelines are added to provide damage estimates for these major oil transmission lines. These oil pipelines are composed of major crude oil and refined product lines only. Regional and local natural gas networks are represented separately and damage is estimated for each. Potable water lines show the greatest amount of leaks and breaks at 18,910 and 12,334, respectively. Local natural gas lines, however, show the greatest leak and break rates per length of pipe at roughly 0.34 leaks/mile (1 leak every 3 miles) and roughly 0.22 breaks/mile (roughly 1 break every 4.5 miles). In addition, local and regional damage to natural gas lines can be combined for a total state damage estimate of 16,219 leaks and 11,015 breaks over the combined length of 51,582 miles of natural gas pipeline.

Potable water service is cut off for nearly 447,000 residences the day after the scenario earthquake. This is reduced to roughly 408,000 residences within a week. Even after three months, service has not been restored for nearly 165,000 residences. These estimates are calculated from a formula that uses the damage to the distribution system to determine the repair rate. Additional information on this formula is available in the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual that accompanies the program. This period of time without water prevents thousands of people from remaining in their homes in the weeks and months following the earthquake. Electric power service shows similar trends, with over 426,000, or nearly 20%, of all residences without electric power the day after the earthquake. Even a month after the earthquake, nearly 38,000 residences are still without power. All electric power lines in Tennessee are presumed to be above ground and less likely to incur damage from moderate ground shaking, unlike buried pipelines that are vulnerable to damage from liquefaction and ground deformation.

Pipeline Damage										
System	Total Pipelines (mi)	No. Leaks	No. Breaks							
Potable Water - Local	117,443	18,910	12,334							
Waste Water - Local	70,466	14,956	9,755							
Natural Gas - Regional	4,605	232	587							
Natural Gas - Local	46,977	15,987	10,428							
Oil - Regional	1,018	53	127							

 Table 284: Pipeline Damage

Table	285:	Utility	Service	Interruptions
ant	205.	Ounty	Ser vice	merrupuons

Utility Service Interruptions Number of Households without Service										
	No. Households	Day 1	Day 3	Day 7	Day 30	Day 90				
Potable Water	2 222 005	446,891	433,647	408,112	360,553	164,750				
Electric Power	2,232,905	426,573	296,249	146,276	37,717	508				

The infrastructure damage in HAZUS-MH MR2 is evaluated based on a percentage of reaching a specified damage level. There are various methods available to quantify damage based on the likelihoods of reaching the four damage levels available in HAZUS-MH MR2. Two different methods are employed in this report and are discussed herein.

Some of the following damage tables depict damage at the county level for essential, transportation, and utility facilities. This is the format employed to generate the HAZUS-MH MR2 summary reports for various types of infrastructure and networks. The damage state likelihoods (shown as percentages) represent the **average** damage state likelihoods for all facilities of a given type in a specific county. The damage estimates shown previously for corresponding infrastructure types are based on a different set of criteria as discussed in footnote (10) and employed in the preceding damage tables for this scenario. Both methods are employed in HAZUS-MH MR2 and are valid estimation methodologies, though they generate different estimations of county damage for a specific facility type. Consider the following comparison:

- Shelby County, Tennessee 117 waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to footnote 10:
 - Summation of individual facilities after that facility is deemed 'damaged' or 'undamaged' based on 50% or greater damage likelihood requirement estimates 117 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
 - Estimation procedure according to topic damage tables in this appendix:
 - To determine the percentage of waste water facilities in the at least moderate damage category, add the percentages for moderate, extensive and complete damage for the county then multiply by the number of facilities in that county
 - Using these damage state probabilities averaged over all the facilities in the county provides an estimate of 97 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

In the case of Shelby County, Tennessee, the topic damage tables in this appendix provide a lower estimate of damage as opposed to the facility-by-facility damage summation detailed in footnote (10). Though not illustrated here, other counties in Tennessee are estimated to incur greater damage when this averaging estimation procedure is used. Comparing the total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities for the 37 critical counties in Tennessee shows the following:

- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the HAZUS-MH MR2 procedure for averaging damage at the county level
 - 366 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities
- Total number of at least moderately damaged waste water facilities according to the other HAZUS-MH MR2 method of assessing facility-by-facility damage
 - 375 at least moderately damaged waste water facilities

Comparing damage estimates for these two methods clearly shows that the averaging procedure produces less damage. Other infrastructure categories may or may not follow

this trend thus requiring an investigation of each infrastructure type separately. This is not undertaken here, though it can be done with the information provided in this appendix.

The following tables provide damage and functionality estimates for the NMSZ scenario critical counties in Tennessee. There tables employ the HAZUS-MH MR2 damage methodology of averaging each of four damage levels for a county.

Counties	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Benton	(Itolic)	(Bilgitt)	(Moderate)	(Extensive)	(complete)	Total
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	4,161 1,078 14 0 1	826 904 6 0 0	85 504 3 0 0	5 13 0 0 0	9 7 0 0 0	5,086 2,506 23 0 1
Carroll						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	1,824 54 1 0	4,233 340 8 1 1	2,239 1,099 24 7 1	319 1,035 18 9 1	310 241 6 3	8,925 2,769 57 20 3
Cheatham	0	-	-	-	0	U
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	11,305 2,156 34 4 6	60 204 1 0 0	4 25 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	11,369 2,385 35 4 6
Chester						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	1,843 52 1 0 1	1,710 169 3 0 2	421 556 9 1 3	114 540 7 2 2	60 100 2 1 0	4,148 1,417 22 4 8
Crockett	-	-	5	_	0	0
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	483 6 0 0 0	1,898 28 0 0 0	1,358 96 2 0 0	295 229 7 1 0	527 502 24 6 7	4,561 861 33 7 7 7
Davidson						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	159,343 16,555 3,658 356 412	844 494 93 10 10	52 55 11 1 1	1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	160,240 17,104 3,762 367 423
Decatur						
Single Family Other Residential Commercial Industrial Other	2,629 384 9 2 2	1,081 377 4 1 1	212 450 3 1 0	47 278 1 0 0	10 44 0 0 0	3,980 1,533 17 4 3

Table 286: Building Damage by General Occupancy

Counties	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	
Countres	(None)	(Slight)	(Moderate)	(Extensive)	(Complete)	Total
Dickson						
Single Family	13,021	69	4	0	0	13,094
Other Residential	2,971	264	32	0	0	3,268
Commercial	138	4	0	0	0	142
Industrial	17	0	0	0	0	17
Other	13	0	0	0	0	13
Dyer						
Single Family	3	58	1,264	4,513	5,910	11,748
Other Residential	0	0	46	213	1,653	1,912
Commercial	0	0	0	2	119	121
Industrial	0	0	0	0	29	29
Other	0	0	0	1	18	19
Fayette						
Single Family	1,793	3,844	2,210	388	534	8,769
Other Residential	16	130	586	746	504	1,982
Commercial	1	4	13	11	7	36
Industrial	0	2	10	14	8	34
Other	0	1	1	1	0	3
Gibson						
Single Family	476	3,246	6,603	2,557	2,140	15,022
Other Residential	20	139	520	760	1,218	2,657
Commercial	1	4	22	35	62	124
Industrial	0	0	3	6	18	27
Other	0	1	3	3	9	16
Giles						
Single Family	9,569	51	3	0	0	9,623
Other Residential	2.167	188	23	0	0	2.378
Commercial	70	2	0	0	0	72
Industrial	11	0	0	0	0	11
Other	5	0	0	0	0	5
Hardeman						
Single Family	2,820	2,882	835	194	180	6.911
Other Residential	74	283	970	942	202	2,471
Commercial	1	8	21	15	5	50
Industrial	0	0	1	1	0	2
Other	1	2	4	4	1	12
Hardin	I	-	•	•	-	12
Single Family	6.835	1.257	130	9	381	8.612
Other Residential	1,120	898	495	13	80	2,606
Commercial	27	12	5	0	4	48
Industrial	9	4	3	Õ	2	18
Other	5	2	0	0	0	7

Counties	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	
Countries	(None)	(Slight)	(Moderate)	(Extensive)	(Complete)	Total
Haywood						
Single Family	86	1,324	2,758	590	487	5,245
Other Residential	4	63	244	333	433	1,077
Commercial	0	1	8	16	23	47
Industrial	0	0	1	7	30	38
Other	0	0	0	2	2	4
Henderson						
Single Family	3,125	2,898	713	192	450	7,378
Other Residential	94	355	1,229	1,197	419	3,294
Commercial	2	11	31	23	7	74
Industrial	0	1	4	5	1	11
Other	1	2	6	5	1	15
Henry						
Single Family	4,828	3,418	909	211	262	9,628
Other Residential	806	896	1,285	932	256	4,175
Commercial	3	12	34	25	9	83
Industrial	0	1	5	5	2	13
Other	1	1	2	1	1	6
Hickman						
Single Family	5,695	30	2	0	0	5,727
Other Residential	2,073	201	25	0	0	2,299
Commercial	22	1	0	0	0	23
Industrial	3	0	0	0	0	3
Other	10	0	0	0	0	10
Houston						
Single Family	2,238	115	12	1	0	2,366
Other Residential	718	235	110	2	0	1.065
Commercial	10	0	0	0	0	10
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	4	0	0	0	0	4
Humphreys	•	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	·
Single Family	5.261	559	58	2	0	5.880
Other Residential	1 249	536	267	- 6	0 0	2 058
Commercial	26	10	207	0	0	40
Industrial	1	10	0	0	0	2
Other	1	1	0	0	0	5
I aka	4	1	0	0	0	5
Single Family	711	359	208	38	271	1 587
Other Residential	112	227	40	65	133	372
Commercial	2	0	- 0	1	135	5
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	2	3	5
	U	U	U	4	5	5

Counties	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	
Countres	(None)	(Slight)	(Moderate)	(Extensive)	(Complete)	Total
Lauderdale						
Single Family	13	267	1,608	2,390	2,565	6,843
Other Residential	0	12	91	138	1,604	1,845
Commercial	0	0	0	1	39	40
Industrial	0	0	0	0	10	10
Other	0	0	1	1	12	14
Lawrence						
Single Family	12,171	64	4	0	0	12,239
Other Residential	2,219	196	24	0	0	2,439
Commercial	75	2	0	0	0	77
Industrial	16	0	0	0	0	16
Other	18	0	0	0	0	18
Lewis						
Single Family	3,103	16	1	0	0	3,120
Other Residential	1,132	107	13	0	0	1,252
Commercial	14	0	0	0	0	14
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	2	0	0	0	0	2
Madison						
Single Family	4,298	13,057	7,493	997	1,693	27,538
Other Residential	224	993	1,563	1,137	420	4,337
Commercial	10	63	182	134	67	456
Industrial	1	5	23	28	11	68
Other	2	8	15	12	7	43
Maury						
Single Family	21,758	115	7	0	0	21,880
Other Residential	3,959	317	39	0	0	4,315
Commercial	209	5	1	0	0	215
Industrial	46	1	0	0	0	47
Other	31	1	0	0	0	32
McNairy						
Single Family	4,382	2,510	558	144	97	7,691
Other Residential	373	427	709	549	107	2,165
Commercial	11	9	15	9	3	47
Industrial	17	9	8	5	1	40
Other	2	2	2	2	0	8
Montgomery						
Single Family	38,659	205	13	0	0	38,877
Other Residential	4,971	341	41	0	0	5,353
Commercial	363	9	1	0	0	373
Industrial	18	0	0	0	0	18
Other	36	1	0	0	0	37

Counties	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	
Counties	(None)	(Slight)	(Moderate)	(Extensive)	(Complete)	Total
Obion						
Single Family	2,043	3,911	1,951	315	1,452	9,672
Other Residential	81	146	276	648	1,411	2,562
Commercial	0	2	15	30	57	104
Industrial	0	0	1	2	6	9
Other	0	1	2	4	11	18
Perry						
Single Family	1,953	387	40	2	0	2,382
Other Residential	549	461	258	6	0	1,274
Commercial	13	6	3	0	0	22
Industrial	3	2	1	0	0	6
Other	2	1	0	0	0	3
Robertson						
Single Family	16,944	90	6	0	0	17,040
Other Residential	2,729	234	29	0	0	2,992
Commercial	121	3	0	0	0	124
Industrial	37	1	0	0	0	38
Other	8	0	0	0	0	8
Shelby	-	-	-	-	-	-
Single Family	32,859	118.257	72,880	10.924	36.411	271.331
Other Residential	1 236	4 779	3 075	1 643	6 558	17 291
Commercial	1	12	232	836	2 921	4 002
Industrial	0	1	232	92	348	463
Other	9	37	33	13	233	354
Stewart	,	57	55	75	233	554
Single Family	3 383	518	108	25	5	4 039
Other Residential	779	236	299	23	36	1 573
Commercial	8	3	2))	1	0	1,575
Industrial	2	1	1	0	0	14
Othor	2	1	1	0	0	- -
Tinton	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lipton Single Femily	126	1 9 2 7	6 121	2 220	2 702	15 417
Other Residential	130	1,027	112	3,230	3,793	2 1 2 5
Commonoial	1	18	0	241	2,703	5,155
Loninnercial	0	0	0	5	01 24	04 24
Industrial	0	0	0	0	34	34
Other	0	0	2	2	24	28
Wayne	2 (72	00	10	0	0	2 700
Single Family	3,672	98	10	0	U	3,/80
Other Residential	1,527	266	90	2	U	1,885
Commercial	31	1	0	0	U	32
Industrial	21	1	0	0	0	22
Other	10	0	0	0	0	10

Counties	Green	Green	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
Weekley	(INOILE)	(Singint)	(Mouerate)	(Extensive)	(Complete)	Total
weakiey						
Single Family	982	4,117	3,176	546	708	9,529
Other Residential	63	332	849	959	649	2,852
Commercial	0	3	14	21	24	62
Industrial	0	0	2	6	10	18
Other	0	1	3	3	2	8
Williamson						
Single Family	50,285	266	16	0	0	50,567
Other Residential	2,265	169	20	0	0	2,454
Commercial	605	15	2	0	0	622
Industrial	61	2	0	0	0	63
Other	82	2	0	0	0	84

Counties	Total # of Beds	Day 1		Day 3		Day 7		Day 30		Day 90	
		# of	0/_	# of	0/_	# of	0/_	# of	0/_	# of	0/_
		Beds	70	Beds	70	Beds	70	Beds	70	Beds	70
Benton	93	44	47.30	45	47.90	68	73.30	91	97.60	92	98.80
Carroll	135	1	0.40	1	0.40	4	2.60	39	29.20	76	56.10
Cheatham	29	28	96.40	28	96.50	29	99.30	29	99.90	29	99.90
Chester	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Crockett	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Davidson	5,307	5116	96.40	5121	96.50	5270	99.30	5302	99.90	5302	99.90
Decatur	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dickson	150	145	96.40	145	96.50	149	99.30	150	99.90	150	99.90
Dyer	225	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.10	35	15.50
Fayette	50	0	0.40	0	0.40	1	2.60	15	29.20	28	56.10
Gibson	235	0	0.13	0	0.13	2	0.87	24	10.30	56	23.73
Giles	95	92	96.40	92	96.50	94	99.30	95	99.90	95	99.90
Hardeman	308	1	0.40	1	0.40	8	2.60	90	29.10	173	56.10
Hardin	131	62	47.30	63	47.90	96	73.30	128	97.60	129	98.80
Haywood	62	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.00	9	13.80
Henderson	52	0	0.40	0	0.50	1	2.70	16	29.90	30	57.60
Henry	317	1	0.40	2	0.50	9	2.70	95	29.90	183	57.60
Hickman	84	81	96.40	81	96.50	83	99.30	84	99.90	84	99.90
Houston	40	39	96.40	39	96.50	40	99.30	40	99.90	40	99.90
Humphreys	52	25	47.70	25	48.30	38	73.60	51	97.60	51	98.80
Lake	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lauderdale	70	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.10	11	15.50
Lawrence	107	103	96.40	103	96.50	106	99.30	107	99.90	107	99.90
Lewis	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Madison	876	4	0.40	4	0.40	23	2.60	255	29.10	489	55.88
Maury	255	246	96.40	246	96.50	253	99.30	255	99.90	255	99.90
McNairy	86	0	0.40	0	0.50	2	2.70	26	29.90	50	57.60
Montgomery	314	303	96.40	303	96.50	312	99.30	314	99.90	314	99.90
Obion	173	9	5.10	10	5.60	44	25.30	141	81.40	152	88.00
Perry	53	25	47.30	25	47.90	39	73.30	52	97.60	52	98.80
Robertson	100	96	96.40	97	96.50	99	99.30	100	99.90	100	99.90
Shelby	5,323	232	4.36	256	4.80	1165	21.88	3935	73.92	4377	82.23
Stewart	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tipton	110	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.20	17	15.50
Wayne	80	77	96.40	77	96.50	79	99.30	80	99.90	80	99.90
Weakley	140	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.00	19	13.80
Williamson	299	288	96.40	289	96.50	297	99.30	299	99.90	299	99.90

Table 287: Hospital Functionality
Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Benton	3	47.00
Carroll	6	0.80
Cheatham	3	94.10
Chester	2	0.80
Crockett	4	0.00
Davidson	23	94.10
Decatur	3	16.27
Dickson	4	94.10
Dyer	7	0.00
Fayette	7	0.54
Gibson	9	0.18
Giles	5	94.10
Hardeman	5	0.80
Hardin	3	46.87
Haywood	2	0.00
Henderson	3	0.80
Henry	4	0.80
Hickman	2	94.10
Houston	2	94.10
Humphreys	4	61.23
Lake	3	0.00
Lauderdale	5	0.00
Lawrence	6	94.10
Lewis	2	94.10
Madison	3	0.80
Maury	4	94.10
McNairy	4	12.25
Montgomery	5	94.10
Obion	7	1.00
Perry	1	47.00
Robertson	5	94.10
Shelby	39	0.18
Stewart	3	51.90
Tipton	6	0.00
Wayne	4	83.55
Weakley	7	0.34
Williamson	4	94.10

 Table 288: Police Station Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)
Benton	10	47.00
Carroll	18	0.80
Cheatham	15	94.10
Chester	11	0.78
Crockett	7	0.00
Davidson	205	94.10
Decatur	4	23.95
Dickson	19	94.10
Dyer	17	0.00
Fayette	14	0.56
Gibson	21	0.08
Giles	11	94.10
Hardeman	14	0.79
Hardin	13	47.97
Haywood	8	0.00
Henderson	13	0.80
Henry	10	4.25
Hickman	10	94.10
Houston	5	85.66
Humphreys	10	68.29
Lake	3	0.00
Lauderdale	10	0.00
Lawrence	19	94.10
Lewis	7	94.10
Madison	44	0.79
Maury	26	94.10
McNairy	12	16.05
Montgomery	50	94.10
Obion	11	1.27
Perry	5	47.00
Robertson	22	94.10
Shelby	361	0.12
Stewart	4	60.25
Tipton	14	0.00
Wayne	10	85.66
Weakley	16	0.32
Williamson	57	94.10

Table 289: School Functionality

Counties	Count	Functionality At Day 1 (%)		
Benton	10	46.92		
Carroll	11	0.80		
Cheatham	11	94.10		
Chester	10	0.80		
Crockett	7	0.00		
Davidson	37	94.10		
Decatur	8	29.71		
Dickson	12	94.10		
Dyer	6	0.00		
Fayette	13	0.54		
Gibson	12	0.20		
Giles	12	94.10		
Hardeman	12	0.78		
Hardin	3	46.87		
Haywood	5	0.00		
Henderson	14	0.80		
Henry	17	19.73		
Hickman	7	94.10		
Houston	2	73.00		
Humphreys	9	60.73		
Lake	2	0.00		
Lauderdale	7	0.00		
Lawrence	18	94.10		
Lewis	1	94.10		
Madison	22	0.77		
Maury	12	94.10		
McNairy	22	13.27		
Montgomery	18	94.10		
Obion	10	1.40		
Perry	7	47.00		
Robertson	13	94.10		
Shelby	73	0.29		
Stewart	5	67.02		
Tipton	10	0.00		
Wayne	10	81.44		
Weakley	12	0.38		
Williamson	22	94.10		

 Table 290: Fire Station Functionality

Counties	# of Facilities	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Benton	64	78.20	93.75	95.85	99.31	99.86
Carroll	96	66.91	86.89	90.73	98.07	99.63
Cheatham	71	93.55	98.96	99.43	99.90	99.90
Chester	35	77.66	93.09	95.19	98.80	99.76
Crockett	75	44.15	65.74	74.02	92.65	98.64
Davidson	1,205	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Decatur	35	78.40	94.00	96.10	99.50	99.90
Dickson	138	93.27	98.91	99.40	99.90	99.90
Dyer	159	23.46	34.01	43.96	72.48	95.08
Fayette	129	59.33	80.37	85.62	96.47	99.33
Gibson	245	36.00	54.25	63.66	86.70	97.60
Giles	104	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Hardeman	94	71.99	89.86	92.90	98.48	99.70
Hardin	107	78.32	93.90	96.00	99.42	99.89
Haywood	99	38.99	59.50	68.79	90.38	98.26
Henderson	101	74.52	91.68	94.38	99.13	99.83
Henry	120	75.63	92.19	94.69	99.04	99.80
Hickman	76	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Houston	24	86.42	96.65	97.89	99.72	99.90
Humphreys	83	86.78	96.77	97.97	99.73	99.90
Lake	35	47.15	66.55	72.46	86.93	97.64
Lauderdale	110	23.51	34.10	44.15	72.81	95.12
Lawrence	143	96.11	99.36	99.63	99.90	99.90
Lewis	38	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Madison	394	60.11	81.55	86.61	96.85	99.39
Maury	163	97.76	99.62	99.76	99.90	99.90
McNairy	95	78.26	93.83	95.93	99.37	99.87
Montgomery	252	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Obion	192	49.36	69.89	76.57	91.79	98.50
Perry	56	87.08	96.84	98.00	99.70	99.89
Robertson	151	99.50	99.90	99.90	99.90	99.90
Shelby	1,596	45.45	66.56	74.34	92.01	98.54
Stewart	51	87.40	96.98	98.11	99.74	99.90
Tipton	121	26.80	39.96	50.13	77.58	96.00
Wayne	63	93.20	98.90	99.40	99.90	99.90
Weakley	139	48.80	70.86	78.13	94.04	98.89
Williamson	310	98.73	99.78	99.84	99.90	99.90

Table 291: Communication Functionality

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Benton	6,863	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Carroll	11,779	10.61	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cheatham	12,878	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chester	5,660	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crockett	5,632	86.65	80.43	53.46	0.00	0.00
Davidson	237,405	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Decatur	4,908	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dickson	16,473	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dyer	14,751	99.69	99.67	99.59	98.46	0.00
Fayette	10,467	43.50	31.31	4.80	0.00	0.00
Gibson	19,518	96.66	96.24	95.17	71.88	0.00
Giles	11,713	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hardeman	9,412	2.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hardin	10,426	4.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Haywood	7,558	77.84	72.03	54.02	0.00	0.00
Henderson	10,306	63.78	53.90	24.86	0.00	0.00
Henry	13,019	13.84	1.55	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hickman	8,081	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Houston	3,216	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Humphreys	7,238	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lake	2,410	97.84	96.56	89.71	0.00	0.00
Lauderdale	9,567	99.70	99.66	99.57	97.76	0.00
Lawrence	15,480	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lewis	4,381	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	35,552	51.73	40.35	11.61	0.00	0.00
Maury	26444	0	0	0	0	0
McNairy	9,980	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montgomery	48,330	0	0	0	0	0
Obion	13,182	95.06	94.25	92.1	14.72	0
Perry	3,023	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson	19,906	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	338,366	94.49	94.27	93.8	89.77	48.7
Stewart	4,930	0	0	0	0	0
Tipton	18,106	99.2	99.1	98.9	93.71	0
Wayne	5,936	0	0	0	0	0
Weakley	13,599	52.53	40.87	11.1	0	0
Williamson	44,725	0	0	0	0	0

 Table 292: Households without Potable Water Service

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Benton	1	18.35%	39.26%	28.68%	6.10%	7.59%
Carroll	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cheatham	1	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Chester	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Crockett	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Davidson	5	89.79%	9.43%	0.74%	0.02%	0.00%
Decatur	2	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Dickson	1	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Dyer	2	0.05%	1.38%	12.78%	37.11%	48.66%
Fayette	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gibson	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Giles	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hardeman	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hardin	1	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Haywood	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Henderson	2	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Henry	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hickman	1	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Houston	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Humphreys	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lake	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lauderdale	1	0.04%	1.22%	12.47%	39.93%	46.32%
Lawrence	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lewis	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Madison	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maury	2	69.90%	23.51%	6.05%	0.50%	0.03%
McNairy	1	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Montgomery	1	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Obion	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Perry	1	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Robertson	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shelby	4	0.03	0.20	0.42	0.27	0.07
Stewart	1	0.50	0.38	0.11	0.01	0.00
Tipton	2	0.00	0.02	0.15	0.40	0.43
Wayne	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Weakley	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Williamson	1	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%

 Table 293: Potable Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Benton	903	39	12
Carroll	1,288	154	97
Cheatham	823	5	1
Chester	639	29	13
Crockett	624	620	283
Davidson	3,244	18	4
Decatur	794	34	9
Dickson	1,372	8	2
Dyer	1,097	3,239	1,859
Fayette	1,485	305	233
Gibson	1,443	1,283	1,130
Giles	1,576	9	2
Hardeman	1,285	81	62
Hardin	1,363	52	79
Haywood	1,123	550	372
Henderson	1,182	118	282
Henry	1,309	115	109
Hickman	1,379	8	2
Houston	536	10	2
Humphreys	1,114	6	2
Lake	350	129	341
Lauderdale	925	2,941	1,572
Lawrence	1,501	8	2
Lewis	578	3	1
Madison	1,379	227	255
Maury	1,843	10	3
McNairy	1,249	57	26
Montgomery	1,976	11	3
Obion	1,230	987	831
Perry	807	4	1
Robertson	1,382	8	2
Shelby	4,734	4,547	2,991
Stewart	1,096	14	4
Tipton	1,097	2,561	1,399
Wayne	1,352	7	2
Weakley	1,329	332	251
Williamson	1,873	10	3

 Table 294: Potable Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# of Households	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Benton	6,863	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Carroll	11,779	53.43	27.21	7.58	0.98	0.08
Cheatham	12,878	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chester	5,660	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crockett	5,632	86.12	60.85	29.44	6.76	0.11
Davidson	237,405	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Decatur	4,908	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dickson	16,473	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dyer	14,751	95.20	85.55	63.54	23.70	0.10
Fayette	10,467	77.80	47.24	18.42	3.50	0.10
Gibson	19,518	89.17	67.98	38.01	10.57	0.10
Giles	11,713	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hardeman	9,412	36.68	18.68	5.21	0.68	0.05
Hardin	10,426	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Haywood	7,558	88.67	65.71	33.77	8.02	0.11
Henderson	10,306	9.34	4.75	1.33	0.17	0.01
Henry	13,019	17.69	9.13	2.70	0.45	0.02
Hickman	8,081	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Houston	3,216	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Humphreys	7,238	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lake	2,410	58.71	40.46	21.99	7.84	0.08
Lauderdale	9,567	94.91	84.37	61.23	22.09	0.10
Lawrence	15,480	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lewis	4,381	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Madison	35,552	75.13	42.52	14.54	2.56	0.10
Maury	26,444	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
McNairy	9,980	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montgomery	48,330	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Obion	13,182	80.76	53.02	25.12	6.93	0.10
Perry	3,023	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Robertson	19,906	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shelby	338,366	84.64	58.32	27.66	6.63	0.10
Stewart	4,930	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Tipton	18,106	93.78	80.59	55.11	18.73	0.10
Wayne	5,936	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Weakley	13,599	82.35	53.59	22.44	4.38	0.10
Williamson	44,725	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 295: Households without Electric Power Service

Counties	# of Facilities	None (%)	Slight (%)	Moderate (%)	Extensive (%)	Complete (%)
Benton	18	19.50%	41.71%	30.46%	6.48%	1.82%
Carroll	22	9.57%	33.63%	39.76%	14.03%	3.00%
Cheatham	10	53.98%	34.77%	10.29%	0.88%	0.05%
Chester	6	18.81%	40.24%	29.39%	6.25%	5.28%
Crockett	5	2.0%	14.8%	36.5%	30.7%	16.0%
Davidson	64	89.79%	9.43%	0.74%	0.02%	0.00%
Decatur	12	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Dickson	16	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Dyer	20	0.05%	1.33%	12.62%	37.68%	48.30%
Fayette	18	6.39%	26.38%	38.27%	19.31%	9.63%
Gibson	20	1.04%	10.01%	32.40%	35.28%	21.26%
Giles	15	89.8%	9.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Hardeman	18	13.84%	36.73%	35.06%	10.48%	3.88%
Hardin	18	19.27%	41.22%	30.11%	6.41%	2.98%
Haywood	23	0.8%	9.4%	33.2%	36.5%	20.1%
Henderson	13	18.88%	41.50%	31.60%	7.20%	0.81%
Henry	28	15.76%	38.91%	34.43%	9.53%	1.36%
Hickman	9	50.0%	37.6%	11.4%	1.0%	0.1%
Houston	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Humphreys	20	30.32%	40.59%	24.01%	4.61%	0.46%
Lake	3	3.01%	18.55%	35.90%	20.47%	22.06%
Lauderdale	15	0.05%	1.35%	12.78%	38.85%	46.94%
Lawrence	9	63.26%	28.20%	7.81%	0.66%	0.04%
Lewis	5	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Madison	29	5.51%	25.24%	39.13%	18.94%	11.16%
Maury	28	74.16%	20.49%	4.91%	0.40%	0.02%
McNairy	10	19.73%	42.20%	30.82%	6.56%	0.67%
Montgomery	22	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Obion	21	2.08%	13.53%	33.21%	29.40%	21.75%
Perry	7	45.68%	38.25%	14.13%	1.78%	0.15%
Robertson	15	89.79%	9.43%	0.74%	0.02%	0.00%
Shelby	117	2.16%	14.88%	35.41%	28.68%	18.84%
Stewart	11	44.50%	38.43%	14.89%	1.99%	0.17%
Tipton	26	0.16%	2.92%	18.50%	39.70%	38.70%
Wayne	7	50.00%	37.59%	11.35%	0.98%	0.06%
Weakley	38	3.17%	19.94%	40.49%	25.12%	11.26%
Williamson	24	84.82%	12.95%	2.07%	0.14%	0.01%

 Table 296: Waste Water Facility Damage

Counties	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
Benton	542	31	10
Carroll	773	122	77
Cheatham	494	4	1
Chester	384	23	11
Crockett	374	491	224
Davidson	1,947	14	4
Decatur	476	27	7
Dickson	823	6	1
Dyer	658	2,562	1,471
Fayette	891	241	184
Gibson	866	1,014	894
Giles	946	7	2
Hardeman	771	64	49
Hardin	818	41	63
Haywood	674	435	294
Henderson	709	93	223
Henry	785	91	86
Hickman	827	6	1
Houston	322	8	2
Humphreys	668	5	1
Lake	210	102	269
Lauderdale	555	2,326	1,243
Lawrence	900	6	2
Lewis	347	3	1
Madison	827	180	202
Maury	1,106	8	2
McNairy	750	45	21
Montgomery	1,186	9	2
Obion	738	781	657
Perry	484	3	1
Robertson	829	6	1
Shelby	2,840	3,596	2,366
Stewart	658	11	3
Tipton	658	2,025	1,107
Wayne	811	6	1
Weakley	797	262	198
Williamson	1,124	8	2

Table 297: Waste Water Pipeline Damage

Counties	# of Bridge	None	Slight	Moderate	Extensive	Complete
Benton	52	90 39%	5 23%	0.30%	0.19%	3 87%
Carroll	122	73 88%	5 76%	3 74%	4 70%	11 89%
Cheatham	38	96 77%	1 97%	0.78%	0.41%	0.06%
Chester	41	69.63%	7 37%	5.16%	6 75%	11.07%
Crockett	56	37 99%	10.99%	8 89%	13 26%	28.85%
Davidson	521	98 52%	0.82%	0.37%	0.23%	0.03%
Decatur	39	87.00%	6.26%	2 15%	2 31%	2 25%
Dickson	68	97.41%	1 45%	0.69%	0.37%	0.05%
Dver	121	11 92%	8.81%	7.76%	15 10%	56 39%
Favette	121	66 43%	5 31%	4 79%	7 81%	15 65%
Gibson	141	46 26%	9.07%	7.84%	11 62%	25 19%
Giles	117	98.01%	1.26%	0.45%	0.23%	0.03%
Hardeman	90	65 65%	7 59%	5 33%	7 13%	14 28%
Hardin	58	82 72%	10.12%	0.67%	0.39%	6.08%
Haywood	133	40.32%	10.12%	8 24%	12 89%	27.68%
Henderson	89	76 47%	7 33%	4 51%	5 76%	5 90%
Henry	86	74.02%	8 36%	4.06%	5.17%	8 35%
Hickman	71	98 55%	0.93%	0.31%	0.17%	0.02%
Houston	22	96 33%	2.37%	0.82%	0.41%	0.02%
Humphreys	 66	96.42%	2.77%	0.50%	0.26%	0.03%
Lake	14	48 79%	8 68%	5 30%	6 68%	30 52%
Lauderdale	94	12.95%	8.94%	8.23%	16.49%	53.36%
Lawrence	43	97.96%	1.26%	0.48%	0.25%	0.03%
Lewis	21	97.49%	1.65%	0.54%	0.27%	0.03%
Madison	145	62.58%	9.18%	6.15%	7.99%	14.08%
Maury	147	98.40%	1.00%	0.36%	0.20%	0.03%
McNairv	90	80.69%	7.33%	2.80%	3.24%	5.92%
Montgomerv	80	98.38%	1.06%	0.34%	0.18%	0.02%
Obion	144	40.99%	9.80%	7.13%	12.34%	29.71%
Perrv	36	91.69%	6.83%	0.45%	0.97%	0.05%
Robertson	79	98.77%	0.82%	0.24%	0.13%	0.02%
Shelby	436	28.61%	8.86%	7.74%	16.26%	38.50%
Stewart	70	94.51%	2.61%	1.06%	1.02%	0.77%
Tipton	54	23.71%	7.95%	8.91%	17.31%	42.10%
Wayne	44	97.70%	1.57%	0.45%	0.23%	0.03%
Weakley	131	60.46%	6.77%	5.63%	8.00%	19.11%
Williamson	127	96.84%	1.94%	0.76%	0.40%	0.05%

Table 298: Highway Bridge Damage

Counties	# of Bridges	At day 1 (%)	At day 3 (%)	At day 7 (%)	At day 30 (%)	At day 90 (%)
Benton	52	94.43	95.82	95.94	96.02	96.38
Carroll	122	79.63	82.18	83.66	84.42	87.54
Cheatham	38	98.43	99.16	99.46	99.51	99.72
Chester	41	77.06	80.43	82.45	83.45	87.55
Crockett	56	49.78	55.16	58.72	60.71	69.23
Davidson	521	99.21	99.51	99.65	99.69	99.80
Decatur	39	92.38	94.58	95.43	95.76	97.05
Dickson	68	98.66	99.21	99.48	99.55	99.73
Dyer	121	22.35	26.89	30.08	32.53	43.83
Fayette	129	72.33	75.08	76.99	78.13	83.05
Gibson	141	56.18	60.77	63.89	65.64	73.11
Giles	117	99.03	99.47	99.65	99.69	99.80
Hardeman	90	73.36	76.83	78.94	80.03	84.52
Hardin	58	90.57	93.31	93.57	93.72	94.32
Haywood	133	51.79	56.93	60.23	62.14	70.42
Henderson	89	83.54	86.71	88.50	89.30	92.54
Henry	86	81.76	85.05	86.66	87.43	90.55
Hickman	71	99.30	99.61	99.73	99.75	99.83
Houston	22	98.30	99.13	99.45	99.51	99.72
Humphreys	66	98.60	99.43	99.63	99.66	99.79
Lake	14	57.61	61.30	63.46	64.74	70.11
Lauderdale	94	23.61	28.33	31.69	34.27	46.05
Lawrence	43	98.99	99.44	99.63	99.67	99.79
Lewis	21	98.83	99.40	99.61	99.65	99.78
Madison	145	71.75	75.86	78.29	79.49	84.39
Maury	147	99.21	99.55	99.69	99.72	99.82
McNairy	90	87.16	89.83	90.94	91.44	93.44
Montgomery	80	99.23	99.59	99.72	99.74	99.82
Obion	144	51.37	55.94	58.82	60.65	68.79
Perry	36	96.94	98.76	98.94	99.04	99.52
Robertson	79	99.42	99.68	99.77	99.79	99.85
Shelby	436	38.78	43.31	46.47	48.80	59.48
Stewart	70	96.77	97.73	98.15	98.29	98.85
Tipton	54	33.65	38.28	41.91	44.44	55.87
Wayne	44	98.96	99.48	99.65	99.68	99.80
Weakley	131	67.78	71.13	73.37	74.63	79.87
Williamson	127	98.47	99.17	99.46	99.52	99.72

 Table 299: Highway Bridge Functionality

Appendix VI: Social Impacts and Economic Losses

The results presented in this appendix are a more comprehensive representation of the information presented in the main section of this report. Each state is discussed individually and results are not summed over all States since different scenarios are employed for each. Only social impacts, induced damage and economic losses are explained herein. All damage to infrastructure is dealt with in another appendix. Social impacts and economic losses are shown for both critical counties and statewide totals. Social impacts include displaced population and short-term shelter estimates as well as feeding and space requirements for the temporary shelter population. Economic losses are shown for buildings, transportation lifelines and utility lifelines. The only form of induced damage included here is debris generation. Maps of social impacts and economic losses are not illustrated here, though are presented in another appendix. Numerous tables are provided, however, to illustrate social impacts and economic losses in each State. Additionally, social impacts and economic loss results both scenarios in Alabama and Indiana are presented herein.

Alabama – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate 112 thousand tons of debris, which will require 4,480 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity, to remove. Of the debris, 78% (87 thousand tons) will be bricks, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (25 thousand tons).

There are roughly 4.4 million people that reside in the State of Alabama. A $M_w7.7$ event in the NMSZ displaces 27 people with the majority of those people living in the 12 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Alabama it is estimated that 5 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 2,400 square feet will be required, with 300 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 5 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 35 gallons of water, 380 pounds of ice, and 70 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 12 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population							
Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekingPopulationPopulationPopulation							
12 Critical Counties	624, 368	24	5				
Remaining Counties	3,822,732	3	0				
Total State	4,447,100	27	5				

Table 1: Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population

Worst Case Casualties (5:00 PM)						
Severity Level 2 (Green) (Yellow) (Red) (Black) Total						
12 Critical Counties	29	3	1	0	32	
Other Remaining Counties	39	6	8	2	56	
Total State	68	9	9	2	88	

Table 2: Worst Case Casualties - Event Occurs at 5:00 PM

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The NMSZ event in Alabama results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 5:00 PM. A total of 88 casualties are expected from this event. There are two estimated fatalities and those occur outside the critical counties, though it is very unlikely that these fatalities occur. The value estimated is likely due to the addition of very small casualty likelihoods over a large area. Roughly 70 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 1: Estimated Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (27 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Alabama (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 17 chronic cases that need to be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 2 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire State of Alabama. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratios are estimated at 5%, and appear to occur randomly throughout the state. This is due to the constant and low level of shaking throughout nearly the entire state. Though any damage that occurs will be minor, there is still a replacement cost associated with the damage. In counties where the value of buildings is not high, the ratio of the cost associated with minor repairs to buildings will be greater than in areas where the value of the built environment is greater. Non-structural damage, including damage to finishes, drywall, and flooring surfaces, total over \$210 million, or over 50% of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute to 10% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the state reach nearly \$1.1 billion for the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. The majority of losses are attributed to utility losses; \$569 million, or nearly 55% of total direct losses (see Table 6). The large amount of loss to the utility systems is due to slight damage to a

very large inventory of utility components. Transportation and building losses contribute far less, with roughly 9% and 38% of the total losses, respectively.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interruption Loses						
Wage	0.00	0.35	10.45	0.45	0.67	11.92
Capital-						
Related	0.00	0.16	7.47	0.28	0.16	8.06
Rental	0.76	2.23	8.05	0.12	0.08	11.23
Relocation	0.07	0.12	0.42	0.01	0.04	0.66
Subtotal	0.83	2.86	26.39	0.86	0.95	31.88
Capital Stock Lo	ses					
Structural	6.70	12.39	17.68	1.83	1.17	39.77
Non-Structural	73.10	43.25	80.14	10.14	6.33	212.96
Content	40.39	11.49	50.23	6.87	4.09	113.07
Inventory	0.00	0.00	4.27	1.91	0.06	6.25
Subtotal	120.19	67.14	152.32	20.75	11.65	372.05
Total	121.01	70.00	178.71	21.61	12.60	403.93

Table 3: Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)

 Table 4: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

	Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)					
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)		
Highway	Segments	80,718.01	0.00	0.00		
	Bridges	11,932.03	22.50	0.19		
	Tunnels	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Railways	Segments	4,228.50	0.00	0.00		
	Bridges	10.27	0.00	0.00		
	Facilities	213.86	3.52	1.65		
Bus	Facilities	23.54	0.58	2.48		
Light Rail	Segments	0.00	0.00	0.00		
	Facilities	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Ferry	Facilities	0.74	0.74	100.00		
Port	Facilities	629.80	11.80	1.87		
Airport	Facilities	2,300.45	50.51	2.20		
	Runways	8,167.82	0.00	0.00		
Total		108,231.00	95.70			

	Direct	Utility Losses (\$ mi	llions)	
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)
Potable Water	Facilities	899.10	5.43	0.60
	Distribution Lines	4,017.90	3.25	0.08
Waste Water	Facilities	24,575.40	116.18	0.47
	Distribution Lines	2,410.75	2.57	0.11
Natural Gas	Facilities	361.00	1.87	0.52
	Local Pipelines	1,607.10	2.75	0.17
	Regional Pipelines	4,926.40	0.02	0.00
Oil Systems	Facilities	10.10	0.04	0.00
	Regional Pipelines	1,645.40	0.00	0.00
Electrical Power	Facilities	141,075.00	430.50	0.31
Communication	Facilities	1,380.70	6.18	0.45
Total		182,908.80	568.77	

Table 5: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Table 6: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses					
System Inventory Value Total Direct Economic Loss					
Buildings	\$269,580,000,000	\$403,930,000			
Transportation	\$108,231,000,000	\$95,700,000			
Utility	\$182,908,800,000	\$568,770,000			
Total	\$559,819,800,000	\$1,068,400,000			



Figure 2: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 12 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Colbert	5	0	0	0	5
Cullman	1	0	0	0	1
Fayette	2	0	0	0	2
Franklin	2	0	0	0	2
Lamar	2	0	0	0	2
Lauderdale	9	1	0	0	10
Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone	1	0	0	0	1
Marion	3	0	0	0	3
Morgan	1	0	0	0	1
Walker	1	0	0	0	1
Winston	2	0	0	0	2

Table 7: Time-of-Day Casualties, 5:00 PM

Table 8: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Colbert	54,984	5	1
Cullman	77,483	0	0
Fayette	18,495	1	0
Franklin	31,223	1	0
Lamar	15,904	1	0
Lauderdale	87,966	13	4
Lawrence	34,803	0	0
Limestone	65,676	0	0
Marion	31,214	2	0
Morgan	111,064	0	0
Walker	70,713	0	0
Winston	24,843	1	0

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Colbert	480	60	35	56	14
Cullman	0	0	0	0	0
Fayette	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Lamar	0	0	0	0	0
Lauderdale	1,920	240	140	224	56
Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone	0	0	0	0	0
Marion	0	0	0	0	0
Morgan	0	0	0	0	0
Walker	0	0	0	0	0
Winston	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9: Shelter Requirements

Table 10: Debris Summary Report

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Colbert	6.06	2.48	8.54
Cullman	0.85	0.16	1.01
Fayette	2.61	1.10	3.71
Franklin	1.72	0.58	2.30
Lamar	2.78	1.04	3.82
Lauderdale	10.36	4.16	14.52
Lawrence	0.34	0.05	0.40
Limestone	0.57	0.09	0.67
Marion	2.96	1.16	4.13
Morgan	1.14	0.22	1.36
Walker	0.83	0.15	0.98
Winston	2.51	1.00	3.51

Alabama – East Tennessee Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate 146 thousand tons of debris, which will require 5,840 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity, to remove. Of the debris, 58% (85 thousand tons) will be bricks, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (61 thousand tons).

There are roughly 4.4 million people that reside in the State of Alabama. A M_w5.9 event in the ETSZ displaces 1,625 people all of whom reside in the 13 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Alabama it is estimated that 440 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 211,200 square feet will be required, with 26,400 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 440 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 15,400 gallons of water, 24,640 pounds of ice, and approximately 6,160 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 13 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population							
Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekingPopulationPopulationPopulation							
13 Critical Counties	1,751,879	1,625	440				
Remaining Counties	2,695,221	0	0				
Total State	4,447,100	1,625	440				

Table 11: Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population

Table 12: Worst Case Casualties – Event Occurs at 2:00 AM

Worst Case Casualties (2:00 AM)							
Severity Level Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 (Green) (Yellow) (Red) (Black) Total							
13 Critical Counties	153	32	3	4	192		
Other Remaining Counties	1	0	0	0	1		
Total for State of Alabama	154	32	3	4	193		

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The ETSZ event in Alabama results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2:00 AM. A total of 193 casualties are expected from this event. There are 4 estimated fatalities and those occur within the critical counties. It is very unlikely that fatalities occur outside the critical counties. The value estimated for casualties is likely due to the addition of very small casualty likelihoods over a large area. Roughly 154 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least sever and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.



• Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.

Figure 3: Estimated Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (1,625)

people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Alabama (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 1,050 chronic cases that need to be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 4 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire State of Alabama. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratio is estimated at nearly 10% and occurs in the northeastern portion of the state. Though any damage that occurs will not be complete damage there is still a replacement cost associated with the damage. In counties where the value of buildings is not high the ratio of the cost associated with minor repairs to buildings will be greater than in areas where the value of the built environment is greater. Non-structural damage, including damage to finishes, drywall, and flooring surfaces, total over \$216 million or over 50% of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute to 11% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural and business interruption losses.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)								
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total		
Business Interru	Business Interruption Loses							
Wage	0.0	0.62	6.66	1.73	0.29	9.30		
Capital-								
Related	0.0	0.27	5.02	1.05	0.08	6.42		
Rental	4.85	3.90	4.18	0.57	0.10	13.60		
Relocation	0.53	0.14	0.24	0.01	0.04	0.96		
Subtotal	5.38	4.93	16.10	3.36	0.51	30.28		
Capital Stock Lo	ses							
Structural	22.14	8.79	9.24	4.77	0.92	45.86		
Non-Structural	117.8	36.95	41.95	15.76	3.49	215.95		
Content	49.74	9.69	31.12	11.97	2.34	104.86		
Inventory	0.0	0.0	2.82	4.22	0.06	7.10		
Subtotal	189.68	55.43	85.13	36.72	6.81	373.77		
Total	195.06	60.36	101.23	40.08	7.32	404.05		

Total direct economic losses for the state reach nearly \$700 million from the ETSZ M5.9 event. The majority of losses are attributed to building losses, \$404 million, or nearly

60% of total direct losses (see Table 16). Furthermore, utility losses contribute to 36% of the total losses while transportation contributes far less, with roughly 6% of the total losses.

Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)					
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)	
Highway	Segments	80,718.01	0.09	0.00	
	Bridges	11,932.03	2.86	0.02	
	Tunnels	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Railways	Segments	4,228.50	0.00	0.00	
	Bridges	10.27	0.00	0.00	
	Facilities	213.86	1.20	0.56	
Bus	Facilities	23.54	0.12	0.52	
Ferry	Facilities	6.74	6.74	100.00	
Port	Facilities	629.80	2.31	0.37	
Airport	Facilities	2,300.45	26.66	1.16	
	Runways	8,167.82	0.00	0.00	
Total		108,231.02	39.98		

Table 14: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 15: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)					
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)	
Potable Water	Facilities	899.10	10.30	1.15	
	Distribution Lines	4,017.90	1.09	0.03	
Waste Water	Facilities	24,575.40	100.76	0.41	
	Distribution Lines	2,410.70	0.86	0.04	
Natural Gas	Facilities	361.00	0.23	0.06	
	Local Pipelines	1,607.10	0.92	0.06	
	Regional Pipelines	4,926.40	0.00	0.00	
Oil Systems	Facilities	10.10	0.00	0.02	
	Regional Pipelines	1,645.40	0.00	0.00	
Electrical Power	Facilities	141,075.00	133.62	0.09	
Communication	Facilities	1,380.70	6.62	0.48	
Total		182,908.80	254.40		

Table 16: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses					
System	Total Direct Economic Loss				
Buildings	\$269,580,000,000	\$404,030,000			
Transportation	\$108,231,020,000	\$39,980,000			
Utility	\$182,908,800,000	\$254,400,000			
Total	\$560,719,820,000	\$698,410,000			



Figure 4: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 13 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Blount	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	1	0	0	0	1
Cherokee	9	1	0	0	10
Dekalb	54	8	1	1	64
Etowah	51	14	1	2	58
Jackson	36	9	1	1	47
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	1	0	0	0	1
Marshall	1	0	0	0	1
Morgan	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Clair	0	0	0	0	0
Talladega	0	0	0	0	0

Table 17: Time-of-Day Casualties, 2:00 AM

Table 18: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Blount	51,024	0	0
Calhoun	112,249	0	0
Cherokee	23,988	4	1
Dekalb	64,452	263	75
Etowah	103,459	803	225
Jackson	53,926	555	139
Jefferson	662,047	0	0
Limestone	65,676	0	0
Madison	276,700	0	0
Marshall	82,231	0	0
Morgan	111,064	0	0
Saint Clair	64,742	0	0
Talladega	80,321	0	0

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Blount	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0
Cherokee	480	60	35	56	14
Dekalb	36,000	4,500	2,625	4,200	1,050
Etowah	108,000	13,500	7,875	12,600	3,150
Jackson	66,720	8,340	4,865	7,784	1,946
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0
Limestone	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	0	0	0	0	0
Marshall	0	0	0	0	0
Morgan	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Clair	0	0	0	0	0
Talladega	0	0	0	0	0

Table 19: Shelter Requirements

Table 20: Debris Summary Report

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Blount	7.74	0.92	8.66
Calhoun	0.77	0.07	0.84
Cherokee	6.82	2.23	9.05
Dekalb	40.74	36.04	76.78
Etowah	13.37	12.21	25.58
Jackson	10.66	9.23	19.89
Jefferson	0.83	0.04	0.87
Limestone	0.12	0.01	0.12
Madison	1.42	0.10	1.52
Marshall	1.23	0.17	1.39
Morgan	0.32	0.02	0.34
Saint Clair	0.30	0.03	0.32
Talladega	0.16	0.01	0.17

Arkansas – New Madrid Seismic Zone

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate approximately 7 million tons of debris, which will require 280,000 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity. Of the debris, 48% (3.4 million tons) will be brick, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (3.6 million tons).

There are roughly 2.7 million people that reside in the State of Arkansas. A $M_w7.7$ event in the NMSZ displaces 127,000 people with the majority of those people living in the 34 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Arkansas it is estimated that 37,250 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 17,877,000 square feet of shelter space will be required, with 2,234,600 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 37,250 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 1,303,540 gallons of water, 2,085,700 pounds of ice, and 24 truckloads of 521,400 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 34 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population					
Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekingPopulationPopulationPopulation					
34 Critical Counties	1,330,090	126,987	37,244		
Remaining Counties	1,334,739	1	0		
Total State	2,664,829	126,988	37,244		

Table 21:	Displaced	and Shelter	Seeking	Population
-----------	-----------	-------------	---------	------------

Worst Case Casualties (2:00 AM)							
Severity Level	Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 (Green) (Yellow) (Red) (Black) Total						
34 Critical Counties	10,275	2,796	306	574	13,951		
Remaining Counties	21	1	4	0	26		
State Total	10,296	2,797	310	574	13,977		

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The NMSZ event in Arkansas results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2:00 AM. A total of 13,977 casualties are expected from this event. There are 574 estimated fatalities of which most occur inside the critical counties. Roughly 10,300 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake



Figure 5: Estimates Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (126,988 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Arkansas (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 79,241 chronic cases that need to

be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 6 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratios are estimated at 75% or more, and occur in the northeastern counties where shaking is most intense. Some eastern counties show loss ratios between 25% and 50% where shaking is moderate. These loss ratios should be considered a concern since 25% to 50% of the total building value in a given census tract is lost. It is more common to see ratios between 0% and 10% in the remainder of the state which is not as critical although still warrants consideration. Also of particular interest is the level of non-structural damage which totals nearly \$7.0 billion or over 55% of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute 15% of all building loses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the state reach nearly \$18.9 billion from the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. The majority of losses are attributed to building losses, \$12.6 billion, or nearly two-thirds of total direct losses (see Table 26). Transportation and utility losses contribute far less, with roughly 11% and 22% of the total losses, respectively.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interru	uption Lose	S				
Wage	0.00	24.71	324.48	17.88	15.74	382.81
Capital-						
Related	0.00	10.93	249.94	10.87	5.23	276.97
Rental	263.72	169.05	126.88	6.93	6.3	572.88
Relocation	29.18	4.67	8.63	0.52	2.16	45.16
Subtotal	292.9	209.36	709.93	36.2	29.43	1,277.82
Capital Stock Lo	ses					
Structural	1,193.05	302.12	355.73	82.57	77.41	2,010.88
Non-Structural	4,135.98	1,270.27	1,046.41	349.41	183.68	6,985.75
Content	1,105.22	283.69	510.33	229.04	96.34	2,224.62
Inventory	0.00	0.00	27.58	64.75	5.83	98.16
Subtotal	6,434.25	1,856.08	1,940.05	725.77	363.26	11,319.41
Total	6,727.15	2,065.44	2,649.98	761.97	392.69	12,597.23

 Table 23: Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)					
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)	
Highway	Segments	49,994.91	1,266.31	2.53	
	Bridges	6,308.93	364.63	5.78	
	Tunnels	9.60	0.00	0.00	
Railways	Segments	3,365.10	87.12	2.59	
	Bridges	4.67	0.35	7.40	
	Facilities	128.97	25.07	19.44	
Bus	Facilities	15.17	1.42	9.33	
Light Rail	Segments Facilities	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	
Ferry	Facilities	0.95	0.95	100.00	
Port	Facilities	187.76	37.22	19.82	
Airport	Facilities	1,488.83	185.08	12.43	
	Runways	6,435.42	186.51	2.90	
Total		67,940.31	2,154.66		

Table 24: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 25: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)						
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)		
Potable Water	Facilities	1,999.00	90.05	4.50		
	Distribution Lines	3,821.70	336.99	8.82		
Waste Water	Facilities	23,814.20	2,650.81	11.13		
	Distribution Lines	2,293.00	266.52	11.62		
Natural Gas	Facilities	92.00	2.49	2.70		
	Local Pipelines	1528.70	284.91	18.64		
	Regional Pipelines	7,308.30	13.96	0.19		
Oil Systems	Facilities	0.90	0.09	10.31		
	Regional Pipelines	1387.50	3.63	0.26		
Electrical Power	Facilities	5,359.20	474.00	8.84		
Communication	Facilities	54.40	3.28	6.03		
Total		47,658.90	4,126.73			

Table 26: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses				
System	Inventory Value	Total Direct Economic Loss		
Buildings	\$157,602,000,000	\$12,597.230,000		
Transportation	\$67,940,310,000	\$2,154,660,000		
Utility	\$47,658,900,000	\$4,126,730,000		
Total	\$273,201,210,000	\$18,878,620,000		



Figure 6: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 34 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Arkansas	21	4	0	0	25
Baxter	1	0	0	0	1
Clay	260	69	7	13	349
Cleburne	2	0	0	0	2
Cleveland	2	0	0	0	2
Craighead	1,884	526	64	122	2,596
Crittenden	1,311	364	40	74	1,789
Cross	448	121	12	22	603
Desha	3	0	0	0	3
Faulkner	1	0	0	0	1
Fulton	0	0	0	0	0
Grant	2	0	0	0	2
Greene	588	155	18	33	794
Independence	7	1	0	0	8
Izard	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	343	92	9	17	461
Jefferson	17	1	0	0	18
Lawrence	226	61	6	12	305
Lee	255	69	7	13	344
Lincoln	4	0	0	0	4
Lonoke	49	11	1	2	63
Mississippi	2,414	673	76	141	3,304
Monroe	26	5	0	1	32
Phillips	325	88	8	15	436
Poinsett	970	273	31	59	1,333
Prairie	14	2	0	0	16
Pulaski	52	4	0	0	56
Randolph	105	27	3	5	140
St. Francis	353	91	9	17	470
Sharp	2	0	0	0	2
Stone	0	0	0	0	0
Van Buren	0	0	0	0	0
White	419	113	11	20	563
Woodruff	171	46	4	8	229

Table 27: Time-of-Day Casualties, 2:00 AM

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Arkansas	20,749	182	52
Baxter	38,386	0	0
Clay	17,609	3,051	891
Cleburne	24,046	0	0
Cleveland	8,571	0	0
Craighead	82,148	20,510	5,345
Crittenden	50,866	17,210	5,180
Cross	19,526	6,204	1,810
Desha	15,341	1	0
Faulkner	86,014	0	0
Fulton	11,642	0	0
Grant	16,464	0	0
Greene	37,331	6,651	1,776
Independence	34,233	1	0
Izard	13,249	0	0
Jackson	18,418	4,413	1,331
Jefferson	84,278	6	2
Lawrence	17,774	2,907	825
Lee	12,580	3,356	1,154
Lincoln	14,492	0	0
Lonoke	52,828	522	129
Mississippi	51,979	30,911	9,365
Monroe	10,254	198	67
Phillips	26,445	4,574	1,527
Poinsett	25,614	12,249	3,555
Prairie	9,539	139	40
Pulaski	361,474	55	15
Randolph	18,195	1,305	374
St. Francis	29,329	4,484	1,419
Sharp	17,119	0	0
Stone	11,499	0	0
Van Buren	16,192	0	0
White	67,165	5,745	1,621
Woodruff	8,741	2,313	766

Table 28: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Arkansas	24,960	3,120	1,820	2,912	728
Baxter	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	427,680	53,460	31,185	49,896	12,474
Cleburne	0	0	0	0	0
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0
Craighead	2,565,600	320,700	187,075	299,320	74,830
Crittenden	2,486,400	310,800	181,300	290,080	72,520
Cross	868,800	108,600	63,350	101,360	25,340
Desha	0	0	0	0	0
Faulkner	0	0	0	0	0
Fulton	0	0	0	0	0
Grant	0	0	0	0	0
Greene	852,480	106,560	62,160	99,456	24,864
Independence	0	0	0	0	0
Izard	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	638,880	79,860	46,585	74,536	18,634
Jefferson	960	120	70	112	28
Lawrence	396,000	49,500	28,875	46,200	11,550
Lee	553,920	69,240	40,390	64,624	16,156
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0
Lonoke	61,920	7,740	4,515	7,224	1,806
Mississippi	4,495,200	561,900	327,775	524,440	131,110
Monroe	32,160	4,020	2,345	3,752	938
Phillips	732,960	91,620	53,445	85,512	21,378
Poinsett	1,706,400	213,300	124,425	199,080	49,770
Prairie	19,200	2,400	1,400	2,240	560
Pulaski	7,200	900	525	840	210
Randolph	179,520	22,440	13,090	20,944	5,236
St. Francis	681,120	85,140	49,665	79,464	19,866
Sharp	0	0	0	0	0
Stone	0	0	0	0	0
Van Buren	0	0	0	0	0
White	778,080	97,260	56,735	90,776	22,694
Woodruff	367,680	45,960	26,810	42,896	10,724

Table 29: Shelter Requirements

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Arkansas	15.93	27.10	43.03
Baxter	0.77	0.11	0.87
Clay	97.15	91.99	189.14
Cleburne	1.57	0.37	1.94
Cleveland	1.85	0.42	2.27
Craighead	664.68	884.90	1,549.58
Crittenden	365.53	419.89	785.42
Cross	135.00	149.01	284.01
Desha	3.38	1.46	4.83
Faulkner	1.45	0.23	1.68
Fulton	0.22	0.03	0.25
Grant	1.11	0.24	1.34
Greene	214.87	220.95	435.83
Independence	9.06	3.29	12.35
Izard	0.24	0.03	0.27
Jackson	109.22	114.11	223.33
Jefferson	20.57	7.24	27.80
Lawrence	72.07	73.44	145.51
Lee	62.82	60.25	123.07
Lincoln	2.96	1.06	4.01
Lonoke	23.68	20.64	44.33
Mississippi	700.41	715.07	1,415.48
Monroe	17.98	19.59	37.57
Phillips	87.02	92.42	179.44
Poinsett	315.27	411.49	726.76
Prairie	9.61	12.84	22.45
Pulaski	89.54	38.70	128.24
Randolph	40.66	41.17	81.83
St. Francis	118.23	126.44	244.67
Sharp	3.93	1.28	5.21
Stone	0.23	0.03	0.26
Van Buren	0.33	0.04	0.37
White	119.86	121.16	241.03
Woodruff	53.61	51.04	104.65

 Table 30: Debris Summary Report
Illinois – New Madrid Seismic Zone

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate 2.57 million tons of debris, which will require 102,800 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity. Of the debris, 54 percent (1.4 million tons) will be bricks, wood, and building contents, with the balance (1.17 million tons) comprising steel and concrete.

There are roughly 12.4 million people that reside in the State of Illinois. A $M_w7.7$ event in the NMSZ displaces 51,500 people with the majority of those people living in the 40 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Illinois it is estimated that roughly 14,700 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 7,063,680 square feet will be required, with 882,960 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for over 14,700 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 161,900 gallons of water, 1,295,000 pounds of ice, and fifteen truckloads of 323,750 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 40 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

	Displaced and Shelter S	eeking Population	
	Total Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
40 Critical Counties	1,347,307	51,426	14,716
Remaining Counties	11,071,996	43	10
Total State	12,419,293	51,469	14,726

	Worst Case	Casualties (2	:00 AM)		
Severity Level	Level 1 (Green)	Level 2 (Yellow)	Level 3 (Red)	Level 4 (Black)	Total
40 Critical Counties	4,478	1,236	146	276	6,136
Other Remaining Counties	109	5	0	0	114
Total for State of Illinois	4,587	1,241	146	276	6,250

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The NMSZ event in Illinois results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2:00 AM. A total of 6,250 casualties are expected from this event. There are 276 estimated fatalities and those occur within the critical counties. Roughly 4,600 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 7: Displaced People with Chronic Illness

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (51,500 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Illinois (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 27,499 chronic cases that need to be cared

for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 8 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratios are estimated at 81%, and occur in the southwestern most counties where shaking is most intense. Some areas along the Mississippi River show loss ratios between 25% and 40% where shaking is moderate. These loss ratios should be considered a concern since 25% to 40% of the total building value in a given census tract is lost. Ratios between 0% and 10% are expected in the remainder of the state. Non-structural damage, including damage to finishes, drywall, and flooring surfaces, total nearly \$3.1 billion or over 56% of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute to 14% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the state reach \$34.1 billion from the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. The majority of losses are attributed to utility losses, \$26.8 billion, or nearly three-fourths of total direct losses. Transportation and building losses contribute far less, with roughly 5% and 16% of the total losses, respectively.

		Direct Building	g Losses (\$ mi	llions)		
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interru	uption Lose	S				
Wage	0.00	10.70	96.28	2.46	8.26	117.70
Capital-						
Related	0.00	4.86	76.42	1.57	2.40	85.25
Rental	91.92	61.26	36.49	0.66	3.46	193.79
Relocation	10.11	1.73	2.35	0.09	1.11	15.39
Subtotal	102.04	78.54	211.54	4.77	15.23	412.13
Capital Stock Lo	ses					
Structural	471.83	152.16	112.95	16.15	33.74	786.83
Non-Structural	1,735.84	735.71	422.62	85.06	121.35	3,100.57
Content	556.99	197.94	246.40	57.69	70.15	1,129.17
Inventory	0.00	0.00	9.35	11.72	1.46	22.53
Subtotal	2,764.66	1,085.81	791.32	170.61	226.69	5,039.09
Total	2,866.70	1,164.35	1,002.86	175.38	241.93	5,451.22

	Direct Tra	ansportation Losses	(\$ millions)	
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)
Highway	Segments	95,066.33	233.74	0.25
	Bridges	21,107.01	276.59	1.31
	Tunnels	0.00	0.00	0.00
Railways	Segments	11,844.99	34.31	0.29
	Bridges	110.98	0.81	1.31
	Facilities	689.64	30.28	4.39
Bus	Facilities	143.98	5.70	3.96
Light Rail	Segments Facilities	124.88 900.41	0.01 900.41	0.01 100.00
Ferry	Facilities	13.31	13.31	100.00
Port	Facilities	1,154.14	69.54	6.03
Airport	Facilities	5,619.99	277.47	4.94
	Runways	24,321.65	41.01	0.17
Total		161,097.31	1,883.18	

Table 34: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 35: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

	Direct Uti	lity Losses (\$ millio	ons)	
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)
Potable Water	Facilities	8,945.00	315.31	3.52
	Distribution Lines	5,308.00	64.99	1.22
Waste Water	Facilities	694,091.20	20,681.05	2.98
	Distribution Lines	3,184.80	51.40	1.61
Natural Gas	Facilities	1,612.80	57.78	3.58
	Local Pipelines	2,123.20	54.94	2.59
	Regional Pipelines	11,623.00	0.10	0.00
Oil Systems	Facilities	30.50	0.57	1.87
	Regional Pipelines	5,689.70	0.08	0.00
Electrical Power	Facilities	265,201.20	5,447.65	2.05
Communication	Facilities	3,866.50	105.37	2.73
Total		1,001,675.90	26,779.24	

Table 36: Total Direct Economic Losses

	Total Direct Economic L	osses
System	Inventory Value	Total Direct Economic Loss
Buildings	\$837,682,000,000	\$5,451,220,000
Transportation	\$161,097,310,000	\$1,883,180,000
Utility	\$1,001,675,900,000	\$26,779,240,000
Total	\$2,000,455,210,000	\$34,113,640,000



Figure 8: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 40 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Alexander	490	141	18	33	682
Bond	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0
Clark	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	2	0	0	0	2
Clinton	69	19	2	4	94
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0
Edwards	1	0	0	0	1
Effingham	0	0	0	0	0
Fayette	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	39	9	1	2	51
Gallatin	4	1	0	0	5
Greene	0	0	0	0	0
Hamilton	8	2	0	0	10
Hardin	1	0	0	0	1
Jackson	327	91	10	19	447
Jasper	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	26	5	0	1	32
Jersey	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson	169	42	5	10	226
Lawrence	61	17	2	4	84
Macoupin	1	0	0	0	1
Madison	577	162	18	33	790
Marion	5	0	0	0	5
Massac	485	135	17	31	668
Monroe	10	2	0	0	12
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0
Perry	26	6	1	1	34
Pope	14	3	0	1	18
Pulaski	314	89	11	22	436
Randolph	138	38	4	8	188
Richland	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Clair	832	228	25	46	1,131
Saline	15	3	0	0	18
Union	673	195	27	53	948
Wabash	28	7	1	1	37
Washington	7	1	0	0	8
Wayne	1	0	0	0	1
White	13	3	0	0	16
Williamson	142	37	4	7	190

Table 37: Time-of-Day Casualties, 2:00 AM

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Alexander	9,590	5,633	1,743
Bond	17,633	0	0
Calhoun	5,084	0	0
Clark	17,008	0	0
Clay	14,560	1	0
Clinton	35,535	1,016	211
Crawford	20,452	0	0
Edwards	6,971	0	0
Effingham	34,264	0	0
Fayette	21,802	0	0
Franklin	39,018	417	114
Gallatin	6,445	25	7
Greene	14,761	0	0
Hamilton	8,621	77	20
Hardin	4,800	0	0
Jackson	59,612	4,090	1,133
Jasper	10,117	0	0
Jefferson	40,045	188	53
Jersey	21,668	0	0
Johnson	12,878	1,689	378
Lawrence	15,452	763	201
Macoupin	49,019	0	0
Madison	258,941	7,706	1,914
Marion	41,691	2	0
Massac	15,161	5,412	1,418
Monroe	27,619	81	17
Montgomery	30,652	0	0
Perry	23,094	290	76
Роре	4,413	81	22
Pulaski	7,348	3,562	1,166
Randolph	33,893	1,819	404
Richland	16,149	0	0
Saint Clair	256,082	9,696	3,507
Saline	26,733	107	29
Union	18,293	6,445	1,693
Wabash	12,937	329	82
Washington	15,148	38	9
Wayne	17,151	0	0
White	15,371	110	29
Williamson	61,296	1,804	480

I ADIC 30. DISDIACCU/SHCILCI SCCKIIIZ I UDUIALIUI

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Alexander	104,580	836,640	61,005	97,608	24,402
Bond	0	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0
Clark	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	12,660	101,280	7,385	11,816	2,954
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0
Edwards	0	0	0	0	0
Effingham	0	0	0	0	0
Fayette	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	6,840	54,720	3,990	6,384	1,596
Gallatin	420	3,360	245	392	98
Greene	0	0	0	0	0
Hamilton	1,200	9,600	700	1,120	280
Hardin	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	67,980	543,840	39,655	63,448	15,862
Jasper	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	3,180	25,440	1,855	2,968	742
Jersey	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson	22,680	181,440	13,230	21,168	5,292
Lawrence	12,060	96,480	7,035	11,256	2,814
Macoupin	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	114,840	918,720	66,990	107,184	26,796
Marion	0	0	0	0	0
Massac	85,080	680,640	49,630	79,408	19,852
Monroe	1,020	8,160	595	952	238
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0
Perry	4,560	36,480	2,660	4,256	1,064
Pope	1,320	10,560	770	1,232	308
Pulaski	69,960	559,680	40,810	65,296	16,324
Randolph	24,240	193,920	14,140	22,624	5,656
Richland	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Clair	210,420	1,683,360	122,745	196,392	49,098
Saline	1,740	13,920	1,015	1,624	406
Union	101,580	812,640	59,255	94,808	23,702
Wabash	4,920	39,360	2,870	4,592	1,148
Washington	540	4,320	315	504	126
Wayne	0	0	0	0	0
White	1,740	13,920	1,015	1,624	406
Williamson	28,800	230,400	16,800	26,880	6,720

Table 39: Shelter Requirements

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others	Concrete & Steel	Total
Counties	(Thousand Tons)	(Thousand Tons)	(Thousand Tons)
Alexander	114.90	117.62	232.52
Bond	0.30	0.04	0.34
Calhoun	0.12	0.01	0.13
Clark	0.33	0.05	0.38
Clay	3.28	1.50	4.78
Clinton	18.42	18.47	36.89
Crawford	0.37	0.04	0.41
Edwards	1.76	0.95	2.71
Effingham	0.75	0.12	0.87
Fayette	0.41	0.06	0.47
Franklin	17.42	10.23	27.65
Gallatin	2.29	1.00	3.29
Greene	0.27	0.03	0.30
Hamilton	3.93	2.38	6.31
Hardin	1.39	0.35	1.74
Jackson	83.57	76.94	160.51
Jasper	0.18	0.02	0.20
Jefferson	15.59	8.87	24.46
Jersey	0.40	0.05	0.45
Johnson	58.09	57.11	115.20
Lawrence	17.90	19.31	37.21
Macoupin	0.91	0.11	1.02
Madison	133.31	122.96	256.27
Marion	5.62	1.82	7.44
Massac	132.86	143.30	276.16
Monroe	6.19	2.35	8.54
Montgomery	0.55	0.06	0.61
Perry	10.95	7.42	18.37
Pope	8.54	6.82	15.36
Pulaski	81.32	88.54	169.86
Randolph	37.57	36.80	74.37
Richland	0.32	0.04	0.36
Saint Clair	192.04	155.48	347.52
Saline	10.24	5.14	15.38
Union	181.59	210.01	391.60
Wabash	9.16	7.54	16.70
Washington	5.08	2.13	7.21
Wayne	1.24	0.36	1.60
White	7.45	3.74	11.19
Williamson	47.88	33.57	81.45

Table 40: Debris Summary Repo

Indiana – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate approximately 282 thousand tons of debris, which will require 11,280 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity, to remove the debris. Of the debris, 73 percent (205 thousand tons) will be brick, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (77 thousand tons).

There are roughly 6.1 million people that reside in the State of Indiana. A M_w7.7 event in the NMSZ displaces 60 people with the majority of those people living in the 11 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Indiana it is estimated that 14 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 6,720 square feet of shelter space will be required, with 840 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 14 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 98 gallons of water, 784 pounds of ice, and 196 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 11 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population					
Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekingPopulationPopulationPopulation					
11 Critical Counties	480,752	52	13		
Remaining Counties	5,599,733	6	1		
Total State	6,080,485	58	14		

Table 41: Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population

Tuble 121 (forst Cuse Cusullies Effent Occurs at Cloo I fr	Table 42:	Worst	Case Ca	sualties -	- Event	Occurs	at 5:00 PM
--	-----------	-------	---------	------------	---------	--------	------------

Worst Case Casualties (5:00 PM)						
Severity Level Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 (Green) (Yellow) (Red) (Black) Tota						
11 Critical Counties	57	12	12	2	83	
Other Remaining Counties	53	4	4	1	62	
Total State	110	16	16	3	145	

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The NMSZ event in Indiana results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 5:00 PM. A total of 145 casualties are expected from this event. There are 3 estimated fatalities while roughly 110 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 9: Estimated Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (60 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Indiana (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 8 chronic cases that need to be cared for within

the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation, and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 10 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state due to a M_w7.7 event in the NMSZ. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratio is estimated at roughly 2%, and occurs in the southern Vanderburgh County where shaking is most intense. Additional southwestern counties show loss ratios between 1% and 2% where shaking is moderate. Loss ratios this low are not considered significant since only a small portion of the building value is lost. Also of particular interest is the level of non-structural damage, which totals nearly \$300 million, or nearly 50%, of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute to 16% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural contents and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the state reach approximately \$1.4 billion from the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. A large portion of losses, \$613 million, or 43% of total direct losses, are attributed to building losses (see Table 46). Utility losses also contribute significantly to total losses, with \$648 million in utility losses alone, or 46% of all direct economic losses. Transportation losses contribute far less, with roughly 11% of the total losses.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interru	uption Lose	S				
Wage	0.00	0.30	15.38	0.78	0.99	17.44
Capital-						
Related	0.00	0.13	12.37	0.51	0.78	13.78
Rental	3.65	3.52	6.56	0.23	0.29	14.26
Relocation	0.35	0.12	0.42	0.03	0.16	1.08
Subtotal	4.00	4.07	34.73	1.54	2.22	46.57
Capital Stock Lo	ses					
Structural	28.74	12.27	15.50	3.91	38.32	98.74
Non-Structural	133.94	57.21	53.07	17.96	33.33	295.51
Content	68.73	18.67	35.47	12.82	27.23	162.92
Inventory	0.00	0.00	1.36	3.06	4.60	9.02
Subtotal	231.42	88.14	105.40	37.75	103.48	566.19
Total	235.42	92.21	140.13	39.29	105.70	612.75

 Table 43: Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)						
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)		
Highway	Segments	70,249.58	19.83	0.03		
	Bridges	10,749.46	23.35	0.22		
	Tunnels	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Railways	Segments	6,475.16	1.84	0.03		
	Bridges	10.40	0.00	0.00		
	Facilities	204.33	7.85	3.84		
Bus	Facilities	51.64	1.09	2.11		
Ferry	Facilities	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Port	Facilities	196.40	9.97	5.08		
Airport	Facilities	2,784.30	60.57	2.18		
	Runways	17,222.67	4.44	0.03		
Total		107,973.10	158.10			

Table 44: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 45: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)						
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)		
Potable Water	Facilities	3,292.70	17.78	0.54		
	Distribution Lines	3,587.60	8.79	0.24		
Waste Water	Facilities	30,594.70	127.60	0.42		
	Distribution Lines	2,152.50	6.95	0.32		
Natural Gas	Facilities	32.60	0.15	0.47		
	ALL Pipelines	8,592.60	7.74	0.09		
Oil Systems	Facilities	17.50	0.18	1.05		
	Regional Pipelines	2,672.20	0.31	0.01		
Electrical Power	Facilities	89,733.60	467.67	0.52		
Communication	Facilities	2,232.90	10.71	0.48		
Total		142,809.89	647.88			

Table 46: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses					
System	Inventory Value	Total Direct Economic Loss			
Buildings	\$380,969,000,000	\$612,750,000			
Transportation	\$107,793,100,000	\$158,100,000			
Utility	\$142,908,890,000	\$647,880,000			
Total	\$631,670,990,000	\$1,418,730,000			



Figure 10: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 11 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Daviess	2	0	0	0	2
Dubois	0	0	0	0	0
Gibson	2	1	1	0	4
Greene	0	0	0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0	0	0
Pike	1	0	0	0	2
Posey	1	1	1	0	3
Spencer	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	0	0	0	0	0
Vanderburgh	42	8	8	2	61
Warrick	9	2	2	0	12

Table 47: Time-of-Day Casualties, 5:00 PM

Table 48: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Daviess	29,820	0	0
Dubois	39,674	0	0
Gibson	32,500	0	0
Greene	33,157	0	0
Knox	39,256	0	0
Pike	12,837	0	0
Posey	27,061	0	0
Spencer	20,391	0	0
Sullivan	21,751	0	0
Vanderburgh	171,922	48	12
Warrick	52,383	4	1

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Daviess	0	0	0	0	0
Dubois	0	0	0	0	0
Gibson	0	0	0	0	0
Greene	0	0	0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0	0	0
Pike	0	0	0	0	0
Posey	0	0	0	0	0
Spencer	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	0	0	0	0	0
Vanderburgh	5,760	720	420	672	168
Warrick	480	60	35	56	14

Table 49: Shelter Requirements

Table 50: Debris Summary Report

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Daviess	2.16	0.75	2.91
Dubois	0.78	0.13	0.91
Gibson	2.08	0.53	2.61
Greene	0.62	0.08	0.70
Knox	0.72	0.10	0.82
Pike	1.97	0.65	2.62
Posey	1.45	0.21	1.65
Spencer	0.39	0.05	0.43
Sullivan	0.34	0.04	0.38
Vanderburgh	84.73	58.73	143.47
Warrick	12.01	3.45	15.45

Indiana – Wabash Valley Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate approximately 1.76 million tons of debris, which will require 70,000 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity to remove. Of the debris, 47% (826 thousand tons) will be brick, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (933 thousand tons).

There are roughly 6.1 million people that reside in the State of Indiana. A $M_w7.1$ event in the WVSZ displaces over 27,600 people with the majority of those people living in the 11 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Indiana it is estimated that approximately 7,000 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 3,372,960 square feet of shelter space will be required, with 421,620 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 7,000 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 245,945 gallons of water, 393,512 pounds of ice, and 5 truckloads of 98,378 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 11 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Table 51: Displaced and Sherter Seeking I optilation						
Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population						
Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekingPopulationPopulationPopulation						
11 Critical Counties	480,752	26,721	6,815			
Remaining Counties 5,599,733 899 21						
Total State 6,080,485 27,620 7,027						

Table 51: Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population

Worst Case Casualties (2:00 AM)						
Severity Level Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 (Green) (Yellow) (Red) (Black) Total						
11 Critical Counties	2,012	572	64	118	2,766	
Other Remaining Counties	193	24	1	3	221	
Total State	2,205	596	65	121	2,987	

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The WVSZ event in Indiana results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2:00 AM. A total of 2,987 casualties are expected from this event. There are 121 estimated fatalities and roughly 2,200 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 11: Estimated Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (27,620 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Indiana (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 16,130 chronic cases that need to be cared

for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Figure 12 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state due to the $M_w7.1$ event on the Wabash Valley Fault. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratio is estimated at roughly 27%, and occurs in western Knox County. Additionally, Gibson County, where shaking is slightly less severe, shows loss ratios between 10% and 20%. More common loss ratios are below 2%, and are not considered significant since only a small portion of the building value is lost. Also of particular interest is the level of non-structural damage, which totals over \$2.1 billion, or over 50% of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute to 16% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural contents and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the state are greater than \$7.2 billion from the Wabash Valley M_w 7.1 event. The building losses total \$3.9 billion, or 54% of total direct losses. Utility losses also contribute a significant portion to total losses as well, with \$2.94 billion in losses, or 41% of all direct economic losses. Transportation losses contribute far less, with roughly 5% of the total losses.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interru	ption Lose	S				
Wage	0.00	6.84	62.61	1.98	5.77	77.20
Capital-						
Related	0.00	3.10	48.71	1.20	9.32	62.34
Rental	49.78	41.77	20.64	0.61	1.62	114.43
Relocation	5.40	0.89	1.64	0.05	0.74	8.72
Subtotal	55.19	52.59	133.60	3.85	17.45	262.68
Capital Stock Lo	sses					
Structural	286.32	69.38	66.47	10.68	201.97	634.82
Non-Structural	1,087.65	412.33	275.95	64.10	266.43	2,106.45
Content	367.17	112.13	164.83	43.53	185.63	873.28
Inventory	0.00	0.00	5.78	10.74	33.78	50.30
Subtotal	1,741.13	593.84	513.03	129.04	687.81	3,664.85
Total	1,796.32	646.44	646.63	132.89	705.26	3,927.53

Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)							
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)			
Highway	Segments	70,249.58	107.98	0.15			
	Bridges	10,749.46	49.12	0.46			
	Tunnels	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Railways	Segments	6,475.16	9.07	0.14			
	Bridges	10.40	0.00	0.00			
	Facilities	204.33	8.77	4.29			
Bus	Facilities	51.64	3.78	7.32			
Ferry	Facilities	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Port	Facilities	196.40	10.34	5.26			
Airport	Facilities	2,784.30	136.23	4.89			
	Runways	17,222.67	30.58	0.18			
Total		107,973.10	385.10				

Table 54: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 55: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)						
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)		
Potable Water	Facilities	3,292.70	102.84	3.12		
	Distribution Lines	3,587.60	28.19	0.79		
Waste Water	Facilities	30,594.70	573.33	1.87		
	Distribution Lines	2,152.50	22.30	1.04		
Natural Gas	Facilities	32.60	0.64	1.96		
	ALL Pipelines	8,592.60	24.33	0.28		
Oil Systems	Facilities	17.50	0.51	2.89		
	Regional Pipelines	2,672.20	1.09	0.04		
Electrical Power	Facilities	89,733.60	2,138.72	2.38		
Communication	Facilities	2,232.90	44.30	1.98		
Total		142,809.89	2,936.55			

Table 56: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses						
System	Total Direct Economic Loss					
Buildings	\$380,969,000,000	\$3,927,530,000				
Transportation	\$107,793,100,000	\$385,100,000				
Utility	\$142,908,890,000	\$2,936,550,000				
Total	\$631,670,990,000	\$7,249,180,000				



Figure 12: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 11 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Daviess	11	2	0	0	13
Dubois	5	0	0	0	5
Gibson	338	94	10	18	460
Greene	0	0	0	0	0
Knox	504	145	16	31	696
Pike	1	0	0	0	1
Posey	75	20	2	4	101
Spencer	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	15	4	0	1	20
Vanderburgh	1,063	306	35	65	1,469
Warrick	0	0	0	0	0

Table 57: Time-of-Day Casualties, 2:00 AM

Table 58: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Daviess	29,820	109	26
Dubois	39,674	3	1
Gibson	32,500	4,621	1,037
Greene	33,157	0	0
Knox	39,256	6,646	1,854
Pike	12,837	0	0
Posey	27,061	1,030	240
Spencer	20,391	0	0
Sullivan	21,751	86	39
Vanderburgh	171,922	14,226	3,618
Warrick	52,383	0	0

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Daviess	12,480	1,560	910	1,456	364
Dubois	480	60	35	56	14
Gibson	497,760	62,220	36,295	58,072	14,518
Greene	0	0	0	0	0
Knox	889,920	111,240	64,890	103,824	25,956
Pike	0	0	0	0	0
Posey	115,200	14,400	8,400	13,440	3,360
Spencer	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	18,720	2,340	1,365	2,184	546
Vanderburgh	1,736,640	217,080	126,630	202,608	50,652
Warrick	0	0	0	0	0

Table 59: Shelter Requirements

Table 60: Debris Summary Report

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Daviess	6.00	2.79	8.79
Dubois	7.56	2.01	9.57
Gibson	77.77	75.35	153.12
Greene	0.28	0.02	0.30
Knox	119.54	139.15	258.69
Pike	0.69	0.11	0.80
Posey	21.08	18.24	39.33
Spencer	0.18	0.01	0.20
Sullivan	5.10	2.07	7.17
Vanderburgh	364.06	644.76	1,008.82
Warrick	0.39	0.02	0.41

Kentucky – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate 4 million tons of debris, which will require 160,000 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity, to remove. Of the debris, 48% (1.92 million tons) will be bricks, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (2.08 million tons).

There are roughly 4.0 million people that reside in the State of Kentucky. A M_w7.7 event in the NMSZ displaces nearly 78,200 people with the majority of those people living in the 25 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Kentucky it is estimated that nearly 20,700 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 9,918,240 square feet will be required, with 1,239,780 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 20,663 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 723,205 gallons of water, 1,157,128 pounds of ice, and approximately 14 truckloads of MREs (meals ready to eat), 289,282 in total. Quantities are displayed for the 25 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population						
Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekingPopulationPopulationPopulation						
25 Critical Counties	655,184	52,964	13,904			
Remaining Counties	3,386,585	25,225	6,759			
Total State	4,041,769	78,189	20,663			

Table 62: Worst Case Casualties - Event Occurs at 2:00 F
--

Worst Case Casualties (2:00 PM)						
Severity Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 (Green) (Yellow) (Red) (Black) Total						
25 Critical Counties	6,722	2,051	318	593	9,684	
Other Remaining Counties	49	5	1	0	56	
State Total	6,771	2,056	319	593	9,740	

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2AM, the majority of the population is working at 2PM, and many people are commuting at 5PM. The NMSZ event in Kentucky results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2PM. A total of 9,740 casualties are expected from this event. There are 593 estimated fatalities and those occur within the critical counties. It is very unlikely that fatalities occur outside the critical counties. Roughly 6,771 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 13: Estimates Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (78,189 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Kentucky (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 52,387 chronic cases that need to be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from

more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation, and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 14 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost, which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratios are estimated at 75%, and occur in the western Fulton and southern Ballard Counties where shaking is most intense. Additionally, portions of Carlisle, Graves, Marshall, and McCracken Counties show loss ratios between 40% and 60% where shaking is moderate. These loss ratios should be considered a concern since 40% to 60% of the total building value in a given census tract is lost. Ratios between 0% and 10% are expected in most of the remainder of the state. Nonstructural damage, including damage to finishes, drywall, and flooring surfaces, total over \$5.34 billion or more 55% of total building losses. Structural losses only comprise 15% of all building economic losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to content and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the state reach over \$46.0 billion from the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. The majority of losses are attributed to utility losses, \$35.3 billion, or over 75% of total direct losses (see Table 66). Transportation and building losses contribute far less, with roughly 3% and 20% of the total losses, respectively.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interru	uption Lose	S				
Wage	0.00	21.89	252.48	6.52	9.08	289.97
Capital-						
Related	0.00	9.61	192.28	4.06	3.05	208.99
Rental	170.92	111.60	87.94	2.03	4.65	377.14
Relocation	19.15	3.03	6.20	0.21	1.46	30.04
Subtotal	190.06	146.14	538.90	12.81	18.23	906.14
Capital Stock Lo	ses					
Structural	838.67	232.37	301.35	36.78	52.19	1,461.37
Non-Structural	3,028.44	1,017.46	979.86	168.45	141.34	5,335.55
Content	774.46	231.38	502.70	107.30	72.63	1,688.47
Inventory	0.00	0.00	23.66	24.53	3.22	51.41
Subtotal	4,641.57	1,481.22	1,807.57	337.06	269.38	8,536.80
Total	4,831.64	1,627,36	2,346.47	349.87	287.61	9,442.94

 Table 63: Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)							
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)			
Highway	Segments	111,008.12	774.46	0.70			
	Bridges	6,216.70	146.58	2.36			
	Tunnels	18.54	0.00	0.00			
Railways	Segments	4,004.74	33.77	0.84			
	Bridges	18.21	0.21	1.15			
	Facilities	249.96	43.76	17.51			
Bus	Facilities	27.77	1.83	6.60			
Light Rail	Segments Facilities	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00			
Ferry	Facilities	17.09	17.09	100.00			
Port	Facilities	584.00	138.25	23.67			
Airport	Facilities	1,169.68	98.28	8.40			
	Runways	4,721.05	39.25	0.83			
Total		128,035.86	1,291.48				

Table 64: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 65: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)						
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)		
Potable Water	Facilities	5,841.50	220.82	3.78		
	Distribution Lines	3,309.20	88.44	2.67		
Waste Water	Facilities	592,633.40	24,220.98	4.09		
	Distribution Lines	1,985.50	69.95	3.52		
Natural Gas	Facilities	360.00	19.88	5.52		
	Local Pipelines	1,323.70	74.77	5.65		
	Regional Pipelines	7,495.50	5.61	0.07		
Oil Systems	Facilities	8.60	0.55	6.42		
	Regional Pipelines	918.10	1.86	0.20		
Electrical Power	Facilities	182,505.40	10,516.63	5.76		
Communication	Facilities	1,603.00	72.31	4.51		
Total		797,983.90	35,291.80			

Table 66: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses						
System Inventory Value Total Direct Economi						
Buildings	\$259,784,000,000	\$9,442,940,000				
Transportation	\$128,035,860,000	\$1,291,480,000				
Utility	\$797,983,900,000	\$35,291,800,000				
Total	\$1,185,803,760,000	\$46,026,220,000				



Figure 14: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 25 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Ballard	223	69	11	20	3223
Caldwell	3	1	0	0	4
Calloway	266	70	10	19	365
Carlisle	141	43	7	12	203
Christian	13	1	0	0	14
Crittenden	2	0	0	0	2
Daviess	507	157	23	43	730
Fulton	300	94	15	28	437
Graves	781	236	37	67	1,121
Hancock	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson	245	73	11	19	348
Hickman	122	38	6	11	177
Hopkins	94	26	4	6	130
Livingston	53	13	2	3	71
Logan	0	0	0	0	0
Lyon	14	4	0	1	19
Marshall	664	200	32	59	955
McCracken	3,022	945	149	283	4,399
McLean	12	3	0	1	16
Muhlenberg	56	17	2	4	79
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0
Todd	0	0	0	0	0
Trigg	2	0	0	0	2
Union	177	54	8	15	254
Webster	25	7	1	2	35

Table 67: Time-of-Day Casualties, 2:00 PM

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Ballard	8,286	3,113	805
Caldwell	13,060	20	5
Calloway	34,177	3,064	845
Carlisle	5,351	2,548	674
Christian	72,265	15	5
Crittenden	9,384	0	0
Daviess	91,545	9,697	2,362
Fulton	7,752	2,769	897
Graves	37,028	10,745	2,883
Hancock	8,392	0	0
Henderson	44,829	4,864	1,304
Hickman	5,262	1,779	498
Hopkins	46,519	2,453	584
Livingston	9,804	504	126
Logan	26,573	0	0
Lyon	8,080	212	60
Madison	70,872	0	0
Marshall	30,125	5,553	1,360
Mason	16,800	0	0
Muhlenberg	31,839	975	294
Ohio	22,916	0	0
Todd	11,971	0	0
Trigg	12,597	1	0
Union	15,637	3,907	1,010
Webster	14,120	745	192

Table 68: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Ballard	386,400	48,300	28,175	45,080	11,270
Caldwell	2,400	300	175	280	70
Calloway	405,600	50,700	29,575	47,320	11,830
Carlisle	323,520	40,440	23,590	37,744	9,436
Christian	2,400	300	175	280	70
Crittenden	0	0	0	0	0
Daviess	1,133,760	141,720	82,670	132,272	33,068
Fulton	430,560	53,820	31,395	50,232	12,558
Graves	1,383,840	172,980	100,905	161,448	40,362
Hancock	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson	625,920	78,240	45,640	73,024	18,256
Hickman	239,040	29,880	17,430	27,888	6,972
Hopkins	280,320	35,040	20,440	32,704	8,176
Livingston	60,480	7,560	4,410	7,056	1,764
Logan	0	0	0	0	0
Lyon	28,800	3,600	2,100	3,360	840
Madison	0	0	0	0	0
Marshall	652,800	81,600	47,600	76,160	19,040
Mason	0	0	0	0	0
Muhlenberg	141,120	17,640	10,290	16,464	4,116
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0
Todd	0	0	0	0	0
Trigg	0	0	0	0	0
Union	484,800	60,600	35,350	56,560	14,140
Webster	92,160	11,520	6,720	10,752	2,688

Table 69: Shelter Requirements

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Ballard	86.9	96.2	183.1
Caldwell	3.3	1.4	4.7
Calloway	122.0	128.5	250.5
Carlisle	66.0	68.8	134.8
Christian	16.5	7.6	24.1
Crittenden	2.1	0.8	2.9
Daviess	158.0	175.4	333.4
Fulton	78.1	90.8	168.9
Graves	306.8	340.4	647.1
Hancock	0.1	0.0	0.1
Henderson	87.3	93.1	180.3
Hickman	50.5	51.3	101.8
Hopkins	49.1	40.5	89.6
Livingston	23.9	20.6	44.5
Logan	0.4	0.1	0.5
Lyon	6.3	4.8	11.1
Madison	215.2	227.1	442.3
Marshall	756.3	879.5	1,635.8
Mason	7.1	6.0	13.1
Muhlenberg	16.2	18.6	34.8
Ohio	0.3	0.0	0.4
Todd	0.2	0.0	0.2
Trigg	3.4	1.4	4.8
Union	65.6	71.6	137.1
Webster	14.4	12.6	27.1

Table 70: Debris Summary Report

Mississippi – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate approximately 2 million tons of debris, which will require 80,000 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity. Of the debris, 42% (840 thousand tons) will be brick, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (1,160 thousand tons).

There are roughly 2.8 million people that reside in the State of Mississippi. A M_w7.7 event in the NMSZ displaces 21,000 people with the majority of those people living in the 25 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Mississippi it is estimated that 5,550 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 2,671,680 square feet will be required, with 333,960 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 5,550 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 39,000 gallons of water, 312,000 pounds of ice, and four truckloads of 78,000 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 25 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population					
	Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekPopulationPopulation				
25 Critical Counties	748,030	20,832	5,555		
Remaining Counties	2,096,628	34	11		
Total State	2,844,658	20,866	5,566		

Table 72: Worst Case Casual	ties - Event Occurs at 2:00 PM
-----------------------------	--------------------------------

Worst Case Casualties (2:00 PM)						
Severity Level	Level 1 (Green)	Level 2 (Yellow)	Level 3 (Red)	Level 4 (Black)	Total	
25 Critical Counties	2,036	474	45	86	2,641	
Other Remaining Counties	855	294	65	122	1,336	
Total State	2,891	768	110	208	3,977	

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The NMSZ event in Mississippi results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2:00 PM. A total of 3,977 casualties are expected from this event. There are 208 estimated fatalities and roughly 2,891 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 15: Displaced People with Chronic Illness

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (21,000 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Mississippi (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 13,251 chronic cases that need to be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from

more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation, and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 16 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratios are estimated at 33%, and occur in the northwestern Mississippi counties (Desoto, Tate, and Tunica) where shaking is most intense. Additionally, portions of Marshall and Lafayette Counties, where shaking is moderate, show loss ratios between 10% and 20%. These loss ratios should be considered a concern since 10% to 20% of the total building value in a given census tract is lost. It is more common to see ratios between 0% and 10% in the remainder of the state which is not as critical although still warrant consideration. Non-structural damage, including damage to finishes, drywall, and flooring surfaces, total nearly \$1.9 billion, or roughly half of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute to 15% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural contents damage and business interruption losses.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interru	Business Interruption Loses					
Wage Capital-	0.00	28.23	166.29	25.07	11.27	230.86
Related	0.00	12.18	129.50	15.13	3.26	160.07
Rental	38.08	52.80	63.56	9.02	4.23	167.68
Relocation	4.09	1.54	4.40	0.37	1.50	11.91
Subtotal	42.17	94.76	363.75	49.59	20.26	570.53
Capital Stock Loses						
Structural	191.79	114.39	149.87	78.50	33.16	567.70
Non-Structural	793.46	375.21	383.84	222.06	80.76	1,855.33
Content	282.15	74.81	179.88	141.77	39.33	717.94
Inventory	0.00	0.00	9.65	47.64	1.20	58.49
Subtotal	1,267.40	564.41	723.23	489.96	154.45	3,199.46
Total	1,309.57	659.17	1,086.98	539.55	174.72	3,769.99

Total direct economic losses for the state reach over \$9.2 billion from the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. The majority of these losses are attributed to utility losses, in the amount of \$5.44 billion, or nearly 60% of total direct losses (see Table 76). Transportation and building losses contribute far less, with roughly 3% and 41% of the total losses, respectively.

Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)					
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)	
Highway	Segments	48,744.44	84.84	0.17	
	Bridges	10,003.59	81.01	0.81	
	Tunnels	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Railways	Segments	3,114.15	4.32	0.14	
	Bridges	6.09	0.01	0.19	
	Facilities	140.83	4.78	3.39	
Bus	Facilities	37.06	1.84	4.97	
Light Rail	Segments Facilities	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	
Ferry	Facilities	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Port	Facilities	498.48	16.94	3.40	
Airport	Facilities	1,185.92	71.54	6.03	
	Runways	5,415.69	14.45	0.27	
Total		69,176.25	279.73		

Table 74: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 75: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)					
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)	
Potable Water	Facilities	481.20	6.45	1.34	
	Distribution Lines	3,419.10	32.97	0.96	
Waste Water	Facilities	174,358.80	3,855.10	2.21	
	Distribution Lines	2,051.50	26.08	1.27	
Natural Gas	Facilities	384.50	9.04	2.35	
	Local Pipelines	1,367.60	27.88	2.04	
	Regional Pipelines	10,593.50	2.85	0.03	
Oil Systems	Facilities	8.90	0.07	0.73	
	Regional Pipelines	3,053.90	0.26	0.01	
Electrical Power	Facilities	69,938.00	1,460.34	2.09	
Communication	Facilities	783.40	20.89	2.67	
Total		266,440.45	5,441.93		

Table 76: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses			
System	Inventory Value	Total Direct Economic Loss	
Buildings	\$131,314,000,000	\$3,769,990,000	
Transportation	\$69,176,250,000	\$279,730,000	
Utility	\$266,440,450,000	\$5,441,930,000	
Total	\$466,930,700,000	\$9,491,650,000	


Figure 16: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 25 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Alcorn	19	3	0	0	23
Benton	26	5	0	1	33
Bolivar	18	3	0	0	21
Calhoun	3	0	0	0	3
Chickasaw	5	0	0	0	5
Coahoma	25	4	0	1	30
Desoto	926	240	25	46	1,237
Grenada	12	2	0	0	14
Itawamba	4	0	0	0	5
Lafayette	123	26	3	6	158
Lee	15	1	0	0	16
Marshall	147	30	3	5	184
Monroe	7	1	0	0	8
Panola	103	18	1	2	124
Pontotoc	5	0	0	0	6
Prentiss	5	0	0	0	6
Quitman	12	2	0	0	15
Sunflower	15	3	0	0	18
Tallahatchie	26	4	0	0	31
Tate	195	48	5	9	257
Tippah	58	11	1	2	71
Tishomingo	4	0	0	0	4
Tunica	252	68	7	13	340
Union	28	5	0	1	34
Yalobusha	3	0	0	0	3

Table 77: Time-of-Day Casualties, 2:00 PM

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Alcorn	34,558	101	28
Benton	8,026	211	68
Bolivar	40,633	125	49
Calhoun	15,069	1	0
Chickasaw	19,440	1	0
Coahoma	30,622	205	75
Desoto	107,199	11,438	2,556
Grenada	23,263	93	27
Itawamba	22,770	0	0
Lafayette	38,744	844	283
Lee	75,755	9	2
Marshall	34,993	1,318	391
Monroe	38,014	2	1
Panola	34,274	851	271
Pontotoc	26,726	1	0
Prentiss	25,556	2	1
Quitman	10,117	130	48
Sunflower	34,369	50	28
Tallahatchie	14,903	278	96
Tate	25,370	2,114	606
Tippah	20,826	359	102
Tishomingo	19,163	1	0
Tunica	9,227	2,494	869
Union	25,362	203	54
Yalobusha	13,051	1	0

Table 78: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Alcorn	13,440	1,680	980	1,568	392
Benton	32,640	4,080	2,380	3,808	952
Bolivar	23,520	2,940	1,715	2,744	686
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	0
Chickasaw	0	0	0	0	0
Coahoma	36,000	4,500	2,625	4,200	1,050
Desoto	1,226,880	153,360	89,460	143,136	35,784
Grenada	12,960	1,620	945	1,512	378
Itawamba	0	0	0	0	0
Lafayette	135,840	16,980	9,905	15,848	3,962
Lee	960	120	70	112	28
Marshall	187,680	23,460	13,685	21,896	5,474
Monroe	480	60	35	56	14
Panola	130,080	16,260	9,485	15,176	3,794
Pontotoc	0	0	0	0	0
Prentiss	480	60	35	56	14
Quitman	23,040	2,880	1,680	2,688	672
Sunflower	13,440	1,680	980	1,568	392
Tallahatchie	46,080	5,760	3,360	5,376	1,344
Tate	290,880	36,360	21,210	33,936	8,484
Tippah	48,960	6,120	3,570	5,712	1,428
Tishomingo	0	0	0	0	0
Tunica	417,120	52,140	30,415	48,664	12,166
Union	25,920	3,240	1,890	3,024	756
Yalobusha	0	0	0	0	0

Table 79: Shelter Requirements

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Alcorn	14.62	8.88	23.50
Benton	12.68	11.47	24.15
Bolivar	10.42	9.63	20.04
Calhoun	3.06	1.61	4.67
Chickasaw	4.19	2.25	6.44
Coahoma	13.66	32.85	46.51
Desoto	360.68	533.81	894.49
Grenada	8.97	9.81	18.78
Itawamba	4.36	1.68	6.03
Lafayette	102.37	278.90	381.27
Lee	22.78	15.97	38.75
Marshall	64.19	64.34	128.53
Monroe	6.56	2.64	9.19
Panola	49.73	60.55	110.28
Pontotoc	4.94	2.29	7.24
Prentiss	5.23	2.17	7.40
Quitman	5.24	6.62	11.86
Sunflower	5.57	7.70	13.27
Tallahatchie	11.03	15.15	26.18
Tate	72.97	90.66	163.63
Tippah	39.79	50.79	90.58
Tishomingo	4.34	1.84	6.18
Tunica	58.03	64.04	122.07
Union	17.17	12.04	29.21
Yalobusha	2.40	0.77	3.17

Table 80: Debris Summary Report

Missouri – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate approximately 6 million tons of debris, which will require 240,000 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity. Of the debris, 48 percent (2.9 million tons) will be brick, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (3.1 million tons).

There are roughly 5.6 million people that reside in the State of Missouri. A $M_w7.7$ event in the NMSZ displaces 122,000 people with the majority of those people living in the 46 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Missouri it is estimated that 36,700 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 17,617,000 square feet of shelter space will be required, with 2,202,000 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for 36,700 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week post-event, the temporary shelter population will require 1,284,570 gallons of water, 2,055,312 pounds of ice, and 24 truckloads for a total of 513,828 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 46 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population					
Total PopulationDisplacedShelter SeekingPopulationPopulationPopulation					
46 Critical Counties	3,043,805	121,927	36,702		
Remaining Counties	2,551,406	2	2		
Total State	5,595,211	121,929	36,704		

Table 81: Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population	Table 81	81: Displaced	and Shelter	Seeking	Population
--	----------	---------------	-------------	---------	------------

Worst Case Casualties (2:00 AM)						
Severity Level	Level 1 (Green)	Level 2 (Yellow)	Level 3 (Red)	Level 4 (Black)	Total	
46 Critical Counties	11,267	3,177	401	760	15,605	
Remaining Counties	33	1	0	0	34	
Total	11,300	3,178	401	760	15,639	

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The NMSZ event in Missouri results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2:00 AM. A total of 15,639 casualties are expected from this event. There are 760 estimated fatalities which occur within the critical counties. Additionally, about 11,300 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 17: Estimated Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (121,928 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Missouri (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 72,181 chronic cases that need to be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from more than

one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 18 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratio is estimated at 91%, and occurs in western New Madrid and central Dunklin Counties where shaking is most intense. Other portions of these two counties also experience very high loss ratios. Additionally, Pemiscot, Stoddard, Butler and Scott Counties show significant loss ratios of 50% or more. Other counties in the southeastern portion of Missouri experience loss ratios greater than 20%, though ratios between 0% and 10% are expected in the remainder of the state. Non-structural damage, including damage to finishes, drywall, and flooring surfaces, total nearly \$6.5 billion or over 55% of total building losses. Structural losses only contribute 15% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to content and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the State reach nearly \$38.7 billion from the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. The majority of losses are attributed to utility losses, \$25.1 billion, or nearly two-thirds of total direct losses (see Table 86). Transportation and building losses contribute far less, with roughly 5% and 31% of the total losses, respectively.

	Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total	
Business Interruption Loses							
Wage	0.00	39.70	338.40	11.53	19.36	408.99	
Capital- Related	0.00	17.57	267.94	7.08	7.20	299.79	
Rental	185.37	219.57	131.29	3.76	7.47	547.47	
Relocation	20.49	5.23	8.48	0.29	2.67	37.18	
Subtotal	205.87	282.07	746.12	22.67	36.69	1,293.42	
Capital Stock Lo	ses						
Structural	818.20	365.10	412.30	59.66	116.84	1,772.10	
Non-Structural	2,807.49	1,777.17	1,322.23	259.97	288.66	6,455.52	
Content	795.24	418.25	672.28	168.21	157.53	2,211.50	
Inventory	0.00	0.00	28.49	41.02	9.36	78.89	
Subtotal	4,420.92	2,560.51	2,435.31	528.87	572.40	10,518.00	
Total	4,626.80	2,842.59	3,181.43	551.54	609.08	11,811.43	

Table 83: Direct Building I	Losses (\$ millions))
-----------------------------	----------------------	---

	Direct Tra	ansportation Losses	(\$ millions)	
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)
Highway	Segments	\$82,631.70	\$832.06	0.01
	Bridges	\$14,588.52	\$327.51	0.02
	Tunnels	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00
Railways	Segments	\$5,851.51	\$70.29	0.01
	Bridges	\$24.79	\$0.35	0.01
	Facilities	\$280.68	\$39.13	0.14
Bus	Facilities	\$80.83	\$8.03	0.10
Light Rail	Segments Facilities	\$18.26 \$38.17	\$0.05 \$38.17	0.01 1.00
Ferry	Facilities	\$8.98	\$7.86	1.00
Port	Facilities	\$496.38	\$86.68	0.17
Airport	Facilities	\$3,132.34	\$223.34	0.07
	Runways	\$14,085.45	\$138.00	0.01
Total		\$121,237.61	\$1,772.59	

Table 84: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 85: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

	Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)						
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)			
Potable Water	Facilities	\$294,937.10	\$14,585.64	0.05			
	Distribution Lines	\$5,340.80	\$234.20	0.04			
Waste Water	Facilities	\$90,000.50	\$3,624.10	0.04			
	Distribution Lines	\$3,204.50	\$185.23	0.06			
Natural Gas	Facilities	\$397.50	\$36.27	0.09			
	Local Pipelines	\$2,136.30	\$198.01	0.09			
	Regional Pipelines	\$3,220.20	\$7.94	0.00			
Oil Systems	Facilities	\$12.30	\$1.96	0.03			
	Regional Pipelines	\$4,162.20	\$0.33	0.00			
Electrical Power	Facilities	\$159,299.80	\$6,170.69	0.04			
Communication	Facilities	\$2,149.80	\$93.94	0.04			
Total		\$564,861.00	\$25,138.31				

Table 86: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses					
System Inventory Value Total Direct Econom					
Buildings	\$334,877,000,000	\$11,811,430,000			
Transportation	\$121,237,610,000	\$1,772,590,000			
Utility	\$564,861,000,000	\$25,138,310,000			
Total	\$1,020,975,610,000	\$38,722,330,000			



Figure 18: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 46 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury- Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury- Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Audrain	0	0	0	0	0
Bollinger	118	31	4	7	160
Boone	2	0	0	0	2
Butler	1,558	468	66	128	2,220
Callaway	1	0	0	0	1
Cape	400	121	15	28	654
Girardeau	470	121	15	20	054
Carter	28	6	1	1	36
Cole	1	0	0	0	1
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0
Dent	0	0	0	0	0
Douglas	0	0	0	0	0
Dunklin	1,786	521	66	125	2,498
Franklin	2	0	0	0	2
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0
Howell	1	0	0	0	1
Iron	3	0	0	0	3
Jefferson	72	14	2	2	90
Lincoln	1	0	0	0	1
Madison	12	3	0	1	16
Maries	0	0	0	0	0
Miller	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	314	85	10	18	427
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0
New Madrid	893	254	31	59	1,237
Oregon	6	2	0	0	8
Osage	0	0	0	0	0
Ozark	0	0	0	0	0
Pemiscot	984	285	37	/0	1,3/6
Perry	14	3	0	1	18
Phelps	1	0	0	0	1
Pike	0	0	0	0	0
Pulaski	1	0	0	0	1
Reynolds	215	2	0	0	9 200
Ripley	213	55	0	12	200
Saint Charles	3	0	0	0	3
Genevieve	5	0	0	0	5
Saint Francois	12	1	0	0	13
St. Louis City			<i>с</i> -		0 5 10
& St. Louis	2,026	556	65	122	2,769
County	1.059	206	27	60	1 460
Scott	1,058	290	5/	09	1,460
Shannon	3	0	0	0	3

Table 87: Time-of-Day Casualties, 2:00 AM

Stoddard	1,490	435	57	109	2,091
Texas	1	0	0	0	1
Warren	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	5	0	0	0	5
Wayne	154	39	4	8	205

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter-Seeking Population
Audrain	25,853	0	0
Bollinger	12,029	1,213	0
Boone	135,454	1	0
Butler	40,867	15,116	0
Callaway	40,766	0	127
Cape Girardeau	68,693	4,562	0
Carter	5,941	236	34
Cole	71,397	0	0
Crawford	22,804	0	0
Dent	14,927	0	1,160
Douglas	13,084	0	0
Dunklin	33,155	20,574	3,097
Franklin	93,807	0	17
Gasconade	15,342	0	0
Howell	37,238	0	0
Iron	10,,697	1	3,566
Jefferson	198,099	625	30
Lincoln	38,944	0	0
Madison	11,800	120	0
Maries	8,903	0	0
Miller	23,564	0	18
Mississippi	13,427	3,651	655
Montgomery	12,136	0	0
New Madrid	19,760	10,341	0
Oregon	10,344	54	1
Osage	13,062	0	510
Ozark	9,542	0	3,085
Pemiscot	20,047	10,911	0
Perry	18,132	123	4,483
Phelps	39,825	0	0
Pike	18,351	0	0
Pulaski	41,165	0	0
Reynolds	6,689	60	482
Ripley	13,509	2,182	7,316
St. Charles	283,883	0	0
Ste. Genevieve	17,842	1	0
St. Francois	55,641	5	0
St. Louis	1,016,315	1,866	0
Scott	40,422	11,221	127
Shannon	8,324	0	0
Stoddard	29,705	16,226	34
1 exas	23,003	U	U
warren	24,525	U	U 1 1 CO
washington	25,544	l 1 714	1,160
wayne	15,259	1,/14	U 2.007
St. Louis City	348,189	21,123	3,097

Table 88: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counting	Total Space	Sleeping Space	Water Beguired Wook	Ice Required	MREs Dogwirod
Counties	(ft. ²)	Required (ft. ²)	1 (gallons)	Week 1 (lbs.)	Week 1
Audrain	0	0	0	0	0
Bollinger	157,920	0	0	0	0
Boone	0	0	0	0	0
Butler	2,055,360	0	0	0	0
Callaway	0	7,620	889	7,112	1,778
Cape Girardeau	560,160	0	0	0	0
Carter	36,480	2,040	238	1,904	476
Cole	0	0	0	0	0
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0
Dent	0	69,600	8120	64,960	16,240
Douglas	0	0	0	0	0
Dunklin	3,008,160	185,820	21,679	173,432	43,358
Franklin	0	1,020	119	952	238
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0
Howell	0	0	0	0	0
Iron	0	213,960	24,962	199,696	49,924
Jefferson	60,960	1,800	210	1,680	420
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	16,320	0	0	0	0
Maries	0	0	0	0	0
Miller	0	1,080	126	1,008	252
Mississippi	556,800	39,300	4,585	36,680	9,170
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0
New Madrid	1,486,560	0	0	0	0
Oregon	8,160	60	7	56	14
Osage	0	30,600	3,570	28,560	7,140
Ozark	0	185,100	21,595	172,760	43,190
Pemiscot	1,711,680	0	0	0	0
Perry	14,400	268,980	31,381	251,048	62,762
Phelps	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0
Pulaski	0	28.020	0	0	0
Reynolds	8,040 214 400	28,920	5,574	20,992	0,748
Kipley St. Charles	514,400	438,900	51,212	409,696	102,424
St. Charles	0	0	0	0	0
Ste. Genevieve St. François	480	0	0	0	0
St. Francois St. Louis	244 800	0	0	0	0
St. Louis Scott	1 480 800	0 7 620	880	7 112	1 778
Shannon	1,400,000 N	0	007	0	1,770
Staddord	2 151 840	2 040	238	1 904	476
Teves	2,131,040	2,040	250	0	470 0
I CAAS Warron	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	69 600	8 120	64 960	16 240
Wayne	231 360	0,000	0,120	0,200	0
St. Louis City	3.511 680	185 820	21.679	173.432	43.358

Table 89: Shelter Requirements

Counting	Brick, Wood & Others	Concrete & Steel	Total
Counties	(Thousands of Tons)	(Thousands of Tons)	(Thousands of Tons)
Audrain	1	0	1
Bollinger	39	34	73
Boone	3	0	3
Butler	418	554	971
Callaway	1	0	1
Cape Girardeau	207	218	425
Carter	12	9	22
Cole	1	0	2
Crawford	0	0	1
Dent	0	0	0
Douglas	0	0	0
Dunklin	397	444	841
Franklin	2	0	2
Gasconade	0	0	0
Howell	1	0	1
Iron	3	1	4
Jefferson	43	18	61
Lincoln	1	0	1
Madison	6	3	9
Maries	0	0	0
Miller	0	0	1
Mississippi	77	73	151
Montgomery	0	0	0
New Madrid	218	246	464
Oregon	3	1	4
Osage	0	0	0
Ozark	0	0	0
Pemiscot	235	290	525
Perry	9	5	14
Phelps	1	0	1
Pike	0	0	0
Pulaski	1	0	1
Reynolds	4	2	6
Ripley	70	74	145
Saint Charles	5	0	5
Saint Francois	12	4	17
Sainte Genevieve	6	2	8
Saint Louis	184	79	263
Saint Louis City	513	564	1,077
Scott	285	335	620
Shannon	2	1	3
Stoddard	344	377	721
Texas	0	0	1
Warren	0	0	1
Washington	4	1	5
Wayne	63	51	114

Table 90: Total Debris

Tennessee – New Madrid Seismic Zone Scenario

Social and economic losses, as well as induced damage, result from direct damage to infrastructure. The social impacts included in this seismic impact assessment include displaced population estimates, food, ice, lodging and medical requirements for the shelter-seeking population, and casualty estimates.

Damage to the built environment will generate over 20.0 million tons of debris, which will require 800,000 truckloads, each with 25-ton capacity. Of the debris, 43% (8.8 million tons) will be brick, wood, and building contents, with steel and concrete comprising the balance (11.9 million tons).

There are roughly 5.7 million people that reside in the State of Tennessee. A M_w7.7 event in the NMSZ displaces nearly 263,000 people with the majority of those people living in the 37 critical counties. This estimate is only based on structural damage. If utility service interruptions are considered, the estimates of displaced people will be substantially greater. Based on the demographic makeup of Tennessee it is estimated that nearly 73,300 of the displaced residents will seek public shelter. The remainder of the displaced population will seek shelter with family or friends. To accommodate these people, a total area of 35,180,640 square feet of shelter space will be required, with 4,397,580 square feet utilized exclusively for sleeping. The balance of the area is reserved for supporting services. Space would be provided for approximately 73,300 beds or cots. For more detailed estimates of displaced population and the requirements of that population, please see the tables at the conclusion of this scenario discussion. During the first week postevent, the temporary shelter population will require 513,051 gallons of water, 4,104,408 pounds of ice, and 48 truckloads of 1,026,102 MRE's (meals ready to eat) in total. Quantities are displayed for the 37 critical counties for feeding, ice, and sleeping space requirements.

Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population					
Total Population Displaced Shelter See Population Population					
37 Critical Counties	2,699,993	262,907	73,293		
Remaining Counties	2,989,290	2	0		
Total State	5,689,283	262,909	73,293		

Table 91: Displaced and Shelter Seeking Population

Table 92: Worst Case Casualties - Event Occurs at 2:00 PM

Worst Case Casualties (2:00 PM)							
Severity LevelLevel 1Level 2Level 3Level 4(Green)(Yellow)(Red)(Black)							
37 Critical Counties	31,913	9,706	1,544	2,904	46,067		
Other Remaining Counties	11,419	3,759	609	1,184	16,971		
Total State	43,332	13,465	2,153	4,088	63,038		

Casualty estimates are determined for three times of day, which were chosen to represent three distributions of population. People are expected to be home and sleeping at 2:00 AM, the majority of the population is working at 2:00 PM, and many people are commuting at 5:00 PM. The NMSZ event in Tennessee results in the greatest number of casualties if the event occurs at 2:00 PM. A total of 63,038 casualties are expected from this event. There are 4,088 estimated fatalities and roughly 43,332 people are expected to experience minor injuries, termed a 'Level 1' casualty. The descriptions of each casualty severity level are listed below.

Casualties are reported with Simple Triage and Rapid Treatment (START) terminology. Severity levels are indicated by color, green for least severe, and black for a fatality. Listed below are HAZUS-MH MR2 "Severity Levels" and START classifications (colors) defined with descriptions of typical injuries for each severity level:

- Severity Level 1 (Green): Injuries will require rudimentary medical attention but hospitalization is not needed; injuries should be rechecked frequently.
- Severity Level 2 (Yellow): Injuries will require hospitalization but are not considered life-threatening.
- Severity Level 3 (Red): Injuries will require hospitalization and can become life threatening if not promptly treated.
- Severity Level 4 (Black): Victims are killed as a result of the earthquake.



Figure 19: Estimates Number of Displaced People with Chronic Illnesses

In addition to acute illness, typically as a result of the disaster, the needs of the chronically ill are of critical importance to prevent an increase in the vulnerability of the population post-event. By combining estimates of the displaced population (262,909 people) and the prevalence of chronic conditions within Tennessee (Milken Institute, 2007), it is estimated that there will be approximately 170,365 chronic cases that need to be cared for within the displaced population. It is possible that a person may suffer from

more than one condition. Furthermore, medical needs such as eyeglasses, walkers, hearing aids, and dental care will also be required post-event.

Direct economic losses are determined for the three primary infrastructure groups; buildings, transportation, and utilities. Residential occupancy represents the largest portion of direct economic building loss in comparison to all other occupancy types. Figure 20 illustrates the building loss ratios for the entire state. Loss ratios indicate the percentage of building dollar value lost due to seismic activity. This percentage indicates the structural and non-structural building value lost in comparison to the total value of all buildings prior to damage. Loss ratios are an excellent indicator of relative economic loss because the value lost is correlated to the total value of buildings, as opposed to an absolute scale of dollar value lost which can be skewed by greater building values in a census tract. The greatest loss ratios are estimated at 62% and occur in the western Tipton County where shaking is most intense. Additionally, portions of Crockett and Weakley Counties show loss ratios between 30% and 40% where shaking is moderate. These loss ratios should be considered a concern since 30% to 40% of the total building value in a given census tract is lost. Ratios between 0% and 10% are expected in the remainder of the state. Non-structural damage, including damage to finishes, drywall, and flooring surfaces total over \$21.5 billion, or more than half, of total building losses. Structural losses contribute to nearly 20% of all building losses. The remaining building losses are attributed to non-structural and business interruption losses.

Total direct economic losses for the state reach over \$56.6 billion from the NMSZ $M_w7.7$ event. The majority of losses are attributed to building losses, \$40.3 billion, or over 70% of total direct losses (see Table 96). Transportation and utility losses contribute far less, with roughly 3% and 26% of the total losses, respectively.

Direct Building Losses (\$ millions)						
	Single Family	Other Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Others	Total
Business Interruption Loses						
Wage Capital-	0.00	120.87	1,574.04	52.16	52.44	1,799.51
Related	0.00	52.98	1,267.54	31.72	17.40	1,369.64
Rental	553.08	554.54	571.93	17.92	27.46	1,704.92
Relocation	59.55	12.11	39.59	1.56	9.29	122.11
Subtotal	592.63	740.50	3,453.10	103.36	106.60	4,996.18
Capital Stock Lo	ses					
Structural	2,641.50	827.90	1,882.52	272.00	233.92	5,758.84
Non-Structural	9,662.90	4,071.83	5,883.14	1147.00	758.21	21,523.08
Content	2,736.12	934.58	2,858.46	727.76	366.32	7,623.24
Inventory	0.00	0.00	129.36	178.90	7.69	315.95
Subtotal	5,040.51	5,834.32	10,753.49	2,325.66	1,366.15	35,320.12
Total	5,633.14	6,574.82	14,206.58	2,429.02	1,472.74	40,316.30

Table 93:	Direct	Building	Losses	(\$	millions)
-----------	--------	----------	--------	-----	-----------

	Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)						
Transportation System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)			
Highway	Segments	63,750.02	663.40	1.04			
	Bridges	7,319.62	561.51	7.67			
	Tunnels	12.86	0.00	0.00			
Railways	Segments	3,516.79	48.91	1.39			
	Bridges	18.04	0.65	3.62			
	Facilities	247.47	64.96	26.25			
Bus	Facilities	48.92	5.39	11.02			
Light Rail	Segments Facilities	3.09 0.00	0.03 0.00	1.01 0.00			
Ferry	Facilities	5.76	5.76	100.00			
Port	Facilities	388.04	111.75	28.80			
Airport	Facilities	1,510.74	208.52	13.80			
	Runways	5,634.18	75.62	1.34			
Total		82,455.53	1,746.23				

Table 94: Direct Transportation Losses (\$ millions)

Table 95: Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)

Direct Utility Losses (\$ millions)							
Utility System	Component	Inventory Value	Economic Loss	Loss Ratio (%)			
Potable Water	Facilities	2,871.80	181.50	6.32			
	Distribution Lines	3,782.40	161.16	4.26			
Waste Water	Facilities	114,051.20	10,671.34	9.36			
	Distribution Lines	2,269.40	127.46	5.62			
Natural Gas	Facilities	175.50	28.89	16.46			
	Local Pipelines	1,513.00	136.25	9.01			
	Regional Pipelines	5,081.50	9.91	0.20			
Oil Systems	Facilities	10.60	1.27	11.94			
	Regional Pipelines	820.00	2.62	0.32			
Electrical Power	Facilities	41,430.40	3,123.57	7.54			
Communication	Facilities	1,419.40	132.37	9.33			
Total		173,425.20	14,576.34				

Table 96: Total Direct Economic Losses

Total Direct Economic Losses				
System Inventory Value Total Direct Economic				
Buildings	\$329,827,000,000	\$40,316,300,000		
Transportation	\$82,455,530,000	\$1,746,230,000		
Utility	\$173,425,200,000	\$14,576,340,000		
Total	\$585,707,730,000	\$56,638,870,000		



Figure 20: Loss Ratio (% of Total Building Assets)

Additional information on social impacts for the 37 critical counties is illustrated in the following tables.

Counties	Level I (Minor)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delaved Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
Benton	4	1	0	0	5
Carroll	144	35	5	8	192
Cheatham	0	0	0	0	0
Chester	49	11	2	3	65
Crockett	320	100	16	30	466
Davidson	8	0	0	0	8
Decatur	18	4	0	1	23
Dickson	0	0	0	0	0
Dyer	1,487	469	77	142	2,175
Fayette	267	74	11	21	373
Gibson	979	295	47	86	1,407
Giles	0	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	167	40	6	10	223
Hardin	74	22	3	6	105
Haywood	378	113	18	33	542
Henderson	134	32	4	7	177
Henry	150	37	5	9	201
Hickman	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	0	0	0	0	0
Humphreys	2	0	0	0	2
Lake	95	28	4	7	134
Lauderdale	713	223	37	66	1,039
Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0
Lewis	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	922	238	34	62	1,256
Maury	1	0	0	0	1
McNairy	70	16	2	4	92
Montgomery	1	0	0	0	1
Obion	423	126	20	35	604
Perry	1	0	0	0	1
Robertson	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	23,870	7,339	1,171	2,225	34,605
Stewart	7	1	0	0	8
Tipton	1,116	350	57	104	1,627
Wayne	1	0	0	0	1
Weakley	510	152	25	45	732
Williamson	2	0	0	0	2

Table 97: Worst-Case Casualties 2:00 PM

Counties	Population	Displaced Population	Shelter Seeking Population
Benton	16,537	31	8
Carroll	29,475	1,475	395
Cheatham	35,912	0	0
Chester	15,540	475	122
Crockett	14,532	2,798	786
Davidson	569,891	2	1
Decatur	11,731	106	30
Dickson	43,156	0	0
Dyer	37,279	21,942	5,899
Fayette	28,806	2,776	730
Gibson	48,152	9,593	2,576
Giles	29,447	0	0
Hardeman	28,105	1,206	388
Hardin	25,578	1,370	412
Haywood	19,797	3,181	992
Henderson	25,522	2,063	536
Henry	31,115	1,334	387
Hickman	22,295	0	0
Houston	8,088	0	0
Humphreys	17,929	1	0
Lake	7,954	1,642	614
Lauderdale	27,101	13,243	3,975
Lawrence	39,926	0	0
Lewis	11,367	0	0
Madison	91,837	7,636	2,169
Maury	69,498	0	0
McNairy	24,653	522	145
Montgomery	134,768	0	0
Obion	32,450	7,798	2,071
Perry	7,631	0	0
Robertson	54,433	0	0
Shelby	897,472	161,189	45,466
Stewart	12,370	83	22
Tipton	51,271	18,244	4,390
Wayne	16,842	0	0
Weakley	34,895	4,197	1,179
Williamson	126,638	0	0

Table 98: Displaced/Shelter Seeking Population

Counties	Total Space Required (sq. ft.)	Sleeping Space Required (sq. ft.)	Water Required Week 1 (gallons)	Ice Required Week 1 (lbs.)	MREs Required Week 1
Benton	3,840	480	280	448	112
Carroll	189,600	23,700	13,825	22,120	5,530
Cheatham	0	0	0	0	0
Chester	58,560	7,320	4,270	6,832	1,708
Crockett	377,280	47,160	27,510	44,016	11,004
Davidson	480	60	35	56	14
Decatur	14,400	1,800	1,050	1,680	420
Dickson	0	0	0	0	0
Dyer	2,831,520	353,940	206,465	330,344	82,586
Fayette	350,400	43,800	25,550	40,880	10,220
Gibson	1,236,480	154,560	90,160	144,256	36,064
Giles	0	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	186,240	23,280	13,580	21,728	5,432
Hardin	197,760	24,720	14,420	23,072	5,768
Haywood	476,160	59,520	34,720	55,552	13,888
Henderson	257,280	32,160	18,760	30,016	7,504
Henry	185,760	23,220	13,545	21,672	5,418
Hickman	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	0	0	0	0	0
Humphreys	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	294,720	36,840	21,490	34,384	8,596
Lauderdale	1,908,000	238,500	139,125	222,600	55,650
Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0
Lewis	0	0	0	0	0
Madison	1,041,120	130,140	75,915	121,464	30,366
Maury	0	0	0	0	0
McNairy	69,600	8,700	5,075	8,120	2,030
Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0
Obion	994,080	124,260	72,485	115,976	28,994
Perry	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	21,823,680	2,727,960	1,591,310	2,546,096	636,524
Stewart	10,560	1,320	770	1,232	308
Tipton	2,107,200	263,400	153,650	245,840	61,460
Wayne	0	0	0	0	0
Weakley	565,920	70,740	41,265	66,024	16,506
Williamson	0	0	0	0	0

Table 99: Shelter Requirements

Counties	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousand Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousand Tons)	Total (Thousand Tons)
Benton	4.78	1.72	6.50
Carroll	81.25	84.17	165.41
Cheatham	0.38	0.05	0.42
Chester	31.72	31.27	62.99
Crockett	92.23	120.11	212.33
Davidson	9.96	1.72	11.68
Decatur	12.69	8.60	21.29
Dickson	0.56	0.09	0.65
Dyer	502.53	557.54	1,060.07
Fayette	94.33	103.90	198.23
Gibson	312.88	346.09	658.97
Giles	0.40	0.06	0.46
Hardeman	58.71	56.19	114.90
Hardin	29.31	30.89	60.20
Haywood	116.97	163.20	280.17
Henderson	77.20	73.68	150.88
Henry	70.22	72.53	142.75
Hickman	0.26	0.04	0.30
Houston	0.69	0.15	0.83
Humphreys	3.23	1.08	4.31
Lake	28.54	35.58	64.11
Lauderdale	266.04	279.41	545.45
Lawrence	0.50	0.07	0.57
Lewis	0.14	0.02	0.16
Madison	310.18	361.05	671.23
Maury	0.92	0.15	1.07
McNairy	39.13	38.63	77.75
Montgomery	1.59	0.23	1.82
Obion	209.15	270.65	479.79
Perry	2.25	0.95	3.19
Robertson	0.64	0.10	0.74
Shelby	5,799.18	8,511.16	14,310.34
Stewart	7.54	4.54	12.08
Tipton	440.31	490.81	931.13
Wayne	0.76	0.27	1.04
Weakley	158.36	198.73	357.08
Williamson	1.83	0.27	2.11

Table 100: Debris Summary Report

Appendix VII: Guide for Impact Assessment Terminology

Abstract

This terminology guide was developed by the Mid-America Earthquake Center with the objective of providing a summary of definitions that aid in understanding the impact assessment report by non-experts. The information included in this document has been taken and adapted from the manuals of the Loss Assessment Program HAZUS-MH MR2.

The scope of this document includes the description of each component of inventory, definition of damage states and functionality after the occurrence of an earthquake. The four infrastructure systems included in this terminology guide are: General Building Stock, Essential Facilities, Transportation, and Utility Systems. Also, the definition of casualties is included in the second part of the guide.

Table of Contents

Part I

Appendix VII: Guide for Impact Assessment Terminology	517
Abstract	517
1. General Building Stock	519
1.1. Description of Model Building Types	519
1.2. Description of Structural Systems	520
1.3. Description of Nonstructural Components	523
1.4. Description of Building Damage States	524
1.4.1 Structural Damage	525
1.4.2 Nonstructural Damage	534
2. Essential Facilities	536
2.1. Description of Essential Facilities	536
2.2. Description of Building Damage States for Essential Facilities	536
3. Transportation Systems	536
3.1. Highways Transportation System:	536
3.1.1. Description of Highway Components	537
3.1.2. Definition of Damage States of Highway Components	537
3.1.3. Functionality of Highway Components	538
3.2. Railway Transportation System:	539
3.2.1. Description of Railway System Components	539
3.2.2. Definitions of Damage States of Railway System Components	540
3.2.3. Functionality of Railway System Components	543
3.3. Light Rail Transportation System	543
3.3.1. Description of Light Rail Systems	543
3.3.2 Definitions of Damage States of Light Rail Systems	543
3.3.3. Functionality of Light Rail Systems	545
3.4. Bus Transportation System	545
3.4.1. Description of Bus System Components	545
3.4.2 Definitions of Damage States of Bus System Components	546
3.4.4. Functionality of Bus Transportation Systems	547
3.5. Port Transportation Systems	547
3.5.1. Description of Port Transportation Systems	547
3.5.2. Definition of Damage States of Port Transportation Systems	548
3.5.3. Functionality of Port Transportation Systems	549
3.6. Ferry Transportation System	549
3.6.1. Description of Ferry System Components	549
3.6.3. Functionality of Ferry System Components	551
3.7. Airport Transportation System	552
3.7.1. Description of Airport Components	552
3.7.2. Definitions of Damage States	553
3.7.3. Definition of Functionality of Highway Components	554
4. Utility Systems	554
4.1. Potable Water Systems	555

4.1.1 Description of Potable Water System Components	555
4.1.2 Definition of Damage States of Potable Water System Components	557
4.1.3 Functionality of Potable Water System Pipelines	559
4.2. Waste Water Systems	560
4.2.1 Description of Waste Water System Components	560
4.2.2 Definitions of Damage States of Waste Water System Components	561
4.3. Oil Systems	562
4.3.1. Description of Oil System Components	562
4.3.2. Definitions of Damage States of Oil System Components	563
4.4. Natural Gas Systems	564
4.4.1. Description of Natural Gas System Components	564
4.4.2 Definitions of Damage States of Natural Gas System Components	565
4.5. Electric Power Systems	566
4.5.1. Description of Electric Power System Components	566
4.5.2. Definitions of Damage States of Electric Power Systems	567
4.6. Communication Systems	569
4.6.1. Description of Communication System Components	569
4.6.2. Definitions of Damage States	569
5. Casualties	571
5.1. Injury Severity Level I	571
5.2. Injury Severity Level II	571
5.3. Injury Severity Level III	571
5.4. Injury Severity Level IV	571
Conclusion	572

Part I

1. General Building Stock

1.1. Description of Model Building Types

Table 1 lists the 36 model building types employed in the earthquake loss assessment methodology.

			Height			
No.	Label	Description	Range		Typical	
			Name	Stories	Stories	Feet
1	Wl	Wood, Light Frame (≤ 5,000 sq. ft.)		1 - 2	1	14
2	W2	Wood, Commercial and Industrial (>		All	2	24
		5,000 sq. ft.)				
3	SIL	Steel Moment Frame	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
4	S1M		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
5	S1H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
6	S2L	Steel Braced Frame	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
7	S2M		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
8	S2H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
9	S3	Steel Light Frame		All	1	15
10	S4L	Steel Frame with Cast-in-Place Concrete	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
11	S4M	Shear Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
12	S4H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
13	S5L	Steel Frame with Unreinforced Masonry	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	24
14	S5M	Infill Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	60
15	S5H		High-Rise	8+	13	156
16	ClL	Concrete Moment Frame	Low-Rise	1-3	2	20
17	ClM		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
18	ClH		High-Rise	8+	12	120
19	C2L	Concrete Shear Walls	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
20	C2M		Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
21	C2H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
22	C3L	Concrete Frame with Unreinforced	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
23	C3M	Masonry Infill Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
24	C3H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
25	PC1	Precast Concrete Tilt-Up Walls		All	1	15
26	PC2L	Precast Concrete Frames with Concrete	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
27	PC2M	Shear Walls	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
28	PC2H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
29	RM1L	Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with	Low-Rise	1-3	2	20
30	RMIM	Wood or Metal Deck Diaphragms	Mid-Rise	4+	5	50
31	RM2L	Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with	Low-Rise	1 - 3	2	20
32	RM2M	Precast Concrete Diaphragms	Mid-Rise	4 - 7	5	50
33	RM2H		High-Rise	8+	12	120
34	URML	Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Walls	Low-Rise	1 - 2	1	15
35	URMM		Mid-Rise	3+	3	35
36	MH	Mobile Homes		All	1	10

Table 1. Model Building Types

1.2. Description of Structural Systems

A general description of each of the 16 structural systems of model building types is given in the following sections.

Wood, Light Frame (W1)

These are typically single-family or small, multiple-family dwellings of not more than 5,000 square feet of floor area. The essential structural feature of these buildings is repetitive framing by wood rafters or joists on wood stud walls. Loads are light and spans are small. These buildings may have relatively heavy masonry chimneys and may be partially or fully covered with masonry veneer. Most of these buildings, especially the single-family residences, are not engineered but constructed in accordance with "conventional construction" provisions of building codes. Hence, they usually have the components of a lateral-force-resisting system even though it may be incomplete. Lateral loads are transferred by diaphragms to shear walls. The diaphragms are roof panels and floors that may be sheathed with sawn lumber, plywood or fiberboard sheathing. Shear walls are sheathed with boards, stucco, plaster, plywood, gypsum board, particle board, or fiberboard, or interior partition walls sheathed with plaster or gypsum board.

Wood, Greater than 5,000 Sq. Ft. (W2)

These buildings are typically commercial or industrial buildings, or multi-family residential buildings with a floor area greater than 5,000 square feet. These buildings include structural systems framed by beams or major horizontally spanning members over columns. These horizontal members may be glue-laminated (glu-lam) wood, solid-sawn wood beams, or wood trusses, or steel beams or trusses. Lateral loads usually are resisted by wood diaphragms and exterior walls sheathed with plywood, stucco, plaster, or other paneling. The walls may have diagonal rod bracing. Large openings for stores and garages often require post-and-beam framing. Lateral load resistance on those lines may be achieved with steel rigid frames (moment frames) or diagonal bracing.

Steel Moment Frame (S1)

These buildings have a frame of steel columns and beams. In some cases, the beamcolumn connections have very small moment resisting capacity but, in other cases, some of the beams and columns are fully developed as moment frames to resist lateral forces. Usually the structure is concealed on the outside by exterior nonstructural walls, which can be of almost any material (curtain walls, brick masonry, or precast concrete panels), and on the inside by ceilings and column furring. Diaphragms transfer lateral loads to moment-resisting frames. The diaphragms can be almost any material. The frames develop their stiffness by full or partial moment connections. The frames can be located almost anywhere in the building. Usually the columns have their strong directions oriented so that some columns act primarily in one direction while the others act in the other direction. Steel moment frame buildings are typically more flexible than shear wall buildings. This low stiffness can result in large interstory drifts that may lead to relatively greater nonstructural damage.

Steel Braced Frame (S2)

These buildings are similar to steel moment frame buildings except that the vertical components of the lateral-force-resisting system are braced frames rather than moment frames.

Steel Light Frame (S3)

These buildings are pre-engineered and prefabricated with transverse rigid frames. The roof and walls consist of lightweight panels, usually corrugated metal. The frames are designed for maximum efficiency, often with tapered beam and column sections built up of light steel plates. The frames are built in segments and assembled in the field with bolted joints. Lateral loads in the transverse direction are resisted by the rigid frames with loads distributed to them by diaphragm elements, typically rod-braced steel roof framing bays. Tension rod bracing typically resists loads in the longitudinal direction.

Steel Frame with Cast-In-Place Concrete Shear Walls (S4)

The shear walls in these buildings are cast-in-place concrete and may be bearing walls. The steel frame is designed for vertical loads only. Diaphragms of almost any material transfer lateral loads to the shear walls. The steel frame may provide a secondary lateral-force-resisting system depending on the stiffness of the frame and the moment capacity of the beam-column connections. In modern "dual" systems, the steel moment frames are designed to work together with the concrete shear walls.

Steel Frame with Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls (S5)

This is one of the older types of buildings. The infill walls usually are offset from the exterior frame members, wrap around them, and present a smooth masonry exterior with no indication of the frame. Solidly infilled masonry panels, when they fully engage the surrounding frame members (i.e. lie in the same plane), may provide stiffness and lateral load resistance to the structure.

Reinforced Concrete Moment Resisting Frames (C1)

These buildings are similar to steel moment frame buildings except that the frames are reinforced concrete. There are a large variety of frame systems. Some older concrete frames may be proportioned and detailed such that brittle failure of the frame members can occur in earthquakes leading to partial or full collapse of the buildings. Modern frames in zones of high seismicity are proportioned and detailed for ductile behavior and are likely to undergo large deformations during an earthquake without brittle failure of frame members and collapse.

Concrete Shear Walls (C2)

The vertical components of the lateral-force-resisting system in these buildings are concrete shear walls that are usually bearing walls. In older buildings, the walls often are quite extensive and the wall stresses are low but reinforcing is light. In newer buildings, the shear walls often are limited in extent, generating concerns about boundary members and overturning forces.

Concrete Frame Buildings with Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls (C3)

These buildings are similar to steel frame buildings with unreinforced masonry infill walls except that the frame is of reinforced concrete. In these buildings, the shear strength of the columns, after cracking of the infill, may limit the semi-ductile behavior of the system.

Precast Concrete Tilt-Up Walls (PC1)

These buildings have a wood or metal deck roof diaphragm, which often is very large, that distributes lateral forces to precast concrete shear walls. The walls are thin but relatively heavy while the roofs are relatively light. Older or non-seismic-code buildings often have inadequate connections for anchorage of the walls to the roof for out-of-plane forces, and the panel connections often are brittle. Tilt-up buildings usually are one or two stories in height. Walls can have numerous openings for doors and windows of such size that the wall looks more like a frame than a shear wall.

Precast Concrete Frames with Concrete Shear Walls (PC2)

These buildings contain floor and roof diaphragms typically composed of precast concrete elements with or without cast-in-place concrete topping slabs. Precast concrete girders and columns support the diaphragms. The girders often bear on column corbels. Closure strips between precast floor elements and beam-column joints usually are cast-inplace concrete. Welded steel inserts often are used to interconnect precast elements. Precast or cast-in-place concrete shear walls resist lateral loads. For buildings with precast frames and concrete shear walls to perform well, the details used to connect the structural elements must have sufficient strength and displacement capacity; however, in some cases, the connection entails between the precast elements have negligible ductility.

Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with Wood or Metal Deck Diaphragms (RM1)

These buildings have perimeter bearing walls of reinforced brick or concrete-block masonry. These walls are the vertical elements in the lateral-force-resisting system. The floors and roofs are framed with wood joists and beams, either with plywood or braced sheathing, the latter either straight or diagonally sheathed, or with steel beams with metal deck with or without concrete fill. Interior wood posts or steel columns support wood floor framing; steel columns support steel beams.

Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with Precast Concrete Diaphragms (RM2)

These buildings have bearing walls similar to those of reinforced masonry bearing wall structures with wood or metal deck diaphragms, but the roof and floors are composed of precast concrete elements such as planks or tee-beams and the precast roof and floor elements are supported on interior beams and columns of steel or concrete (cast-in-place or precast). The precast horizontal elements often have a cast-in-place topping.

Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Walls (URM)

These buildings include structural elements that vary depending on the building's age and, to a lesser extent, its geographic location. In buildings built before 1900, the majority of floor and roof construction consists of wood sheathing supported by wood framing. In large multistory buildings, the floors are cast-in-place concrete supported by the unreinforced masonry walls and/or steel or concrete interior framing. In unreinforced masonry constructed after 1950 (outside California) wood floors usually have plywood rather than board sheathing. In regions of lower seismicity, buildings of this type constructed more recently can include floor and roof framing that consists of metal deck and concrete fill supported by steel framing elements. The perimeter walls, and possibly some interior walls, are unreinforced masonry. The walls may or may not be anchored to the diaphragms. Ties between the walls and diaphragms are more common for the bearing walls than for walls that are parallel to the floor framing. Roof ties usually are less common and more erratically spaced than those at the floor levels. Interior partitions that interconnect the floors and roof can reduce diaphragm displacements.

Mobile Homes (MH)

These are prefabricated housing units that are trucked to the site and then placed on isolated piers, jack stands, or masonry block foundations (usually without any positive anchorage). Floors and roofs of mobile homes usually are constructed with plywood and outside surfaces are covered with sheet metal.

1.3. Description of Nonstructural Components

Nonstructural components include a large variety of different architectural, mechanical and electrical components. Contents of the buildings are treated as a separate category. Nonstructural components are grouped as either "drift-sensitive" or "acceleration-sensitive" components, in order to assess their damage due to an earthquake. Damage to drift-sensitive nonstructural components is primarily a function of interstory drift; damage to acceleration-sensitive nonstructural components and building contents is primarily a function of floor acceleration. Table 2 lists typical nonstructural components and building contents.

Anchorage/bracing of nonstructural components improves earthquake performance of most components although routine or typical anchorage/bracing provides only limited

damage protection. It is assumed that typical nonstructural components and building contents have limited anchorage/bracing. Nonstructural damage evaluation is dependent upon the response and performance of structural components, as well as being influenced by characteristics of nonstructural components themselves.

Type	Item	Drift- Sensitive*	Acceleration- Sensitive*
Architectural	Nonbearing Walls/Partitions	•	•
	Cantilever Elements and Parapets		•
	Exterior Wall Panels	•	۰
	Veneer and Finishes	•	°
	Penthouses	•	
	Racks and Cabinets		•
	Access Floors		•
	Appendages and Ornaments		•
Mechanical	General Mechanical (boilers, etc.)		•
and	Manufacturing and Process Machinery		•
Electrical	Piping Systems	۰	•
	Storage Tanks and Spheres		•
	HVAC Systems (chillers, ductwork, etc.)	۰	•
	Elevators	۰	•
	Trussed Towers		•
	General Electrical (switchgear, ducts, etc.)	•	•
	Lighting Fixtures		•
Contents	File Cabinets, Bookcases, etc.		•
	Office Equipment and Furnishings		•
	Computer/Communication Equipment		•
	Nonpermanent Manufacturing Equipment		•
	Manufacturing/Storage Inventory		•
	Art and other Valuable Objects		•

Solid dots indicate primary cause of damage, open dots indicate secondary cause of damage

Table 2. List of Typical Nonstructural Components and Contents of Buildings

1.4. Description of Building Damage States

The results of damage estimation methods described in this chapter (i.e., damage predictions for model building types for a given level of ground shaking) are used in other modules of the methodology to estimate: (1) casualties due to structural damage, including fatalities, (2) monetary losses due to building damage (i.e. cost of repairing or replacing damaged buildings and their contents); (3) monetary losses resulting from building damage and closure (e.g., losses due to business interruption); (4) social impacts (e.g., loss of shelter); and, (5) other economic and social impacts.

The building damage predictions may also be used to study expected damage patterns in a given region for different scenario earthquakes (e.g., to identify the most vulnerable building types, or the areas expected to have the most damaged buildings). In order to meet the needs of such broad purposes, damage predictions must allow the user to glean the nature and extent of the physical damage to a building type from the damage prediction output so that life-safety, societal functional and monetary losses which result from the damage can be estimated. Building damage can best be described in terms of its components (beams, columns, walls, ceilings, piping, HVAC equipment, etc.). For example, such component damage descriptions as "shear walls are cracked", "ceiling tiles fell", "diagonal bracing buckled", "wall panels fell out", etc. used together with such terms as "some" and "most" would be sufficient to describe the nature and extent of overall building damage.

Damage to nonstructural components of buildings (i.e., architectural components, such as partition walls and ceilings, and building mechanical/electrical systems) primarily affects monetary and societal functional losses and generates numerous casualties of mostly light-to moderate severity. Hazard mitigation measures are different for nonstructural and structural building components (i.e., the gravity and lateral-load-resisting systems) as well. Hence, it is desirable to separately estimate structural and nonstructural damage.

Building damage varies from "none" to "complete" as a continuous function of building deformations (building response). Wall cracks may vary from invisible or "hairline cracks" to cracks of several inches wide. Generalized "ranges" of damage are used by the Methodology to describe structural and nonstructural damage, since it is not practical to describe building damage as a continuous function.

The Methodology predicts a structural and nonstructural damage state in terms of one of four ranges of damage or "damage states": Slight, Moderate, Extensive, and Complete. For example, the Slight damage state extends from the threshold of Slight damage up to the threshold of Moderate damage. General descriptions of these damage states are provided for all model building types with reference to observable damage incurred by structural (Section 5.3.1) and nonstructural building components (Section 5.3.2). Damage predictions resulting from this physical damage estimation method are then expressed in terms of the probability of a building being in any of these four damage states.

1.4.1 Structural Damage

Descriptions for Slight, Moderate, Extensive, and Complete structural damage states for the 16 basic model building types are provided below. For estimating casualties, the descriptions of Complete damage include the fraction of the total floor area of each model building type that is likely to collapse. Collapse fractions are based on judgment and limited earthquake data considering the material and construction of different model building types.

It is noted that in some cases the structural damage is not directly observable because the structural elements are inaccessible or not visible due to architectural finishes or fireproofing. Hence, these structural damage states are described, when necessary, with reference to certain effects on nonstructural elements that may be indicative of the structural damage state of concern. Small cracks are assumed, throughout this section, to be visible cracks with a maximum width of less than 1/8". Cracks wider than 1/8" are referred to as "large" cracks.

Wood, Light Frame (W1):

Slight Structural Damage: Small plaster or gypsum-board cracks at corners of door and window openings and wall-ceiling intersections; small cracks in masonry chimneys and masonry veneer.

Moderate Structural Damage: Large plaster or gypsum-board cracks at corners of door and window openings; small diagonal cracks across shear wall panels exhibited by small cracks in stucco and gypsum wall panels; large cracks in brick chimneys; toppling of tall masonry chimneys.

Extensive Structural Damage: Large diagonal cracks across shear wall panels or large cracks at plywood joints; permanent lateral movement of floors and roof; toppling of most brick chimneys; cracks in foundations; splitting of wood sill plates and/or slippage of structure over foundations; partial collapse of "room-over-garage" or other "soft-story" configurations; small foundations cracks.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure may have large permanent lateral displacement, may collapse, or be in imminent danger of collapse due to cripple wall failure or the failure of the lateral load resisting system; some structures may slip and fall off the foundations; large foundation cracks. Approximately 3% of the total area of W1 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Wood, Commercial and Industrial (W2):

Slight Structural Damage: Small cracks at corners of door and window openings and wall-ceiling intersections; small cracks on stucco and plaster walls. Some slippage may be observed at bolted connections.

Moderate Structural Damage: Larger cracks at corners of door and window openings; small diagonal cracks across shear wall panels exhibited by cracks in stucco and gypsum wall panels; minor slack (less than 1/8" extension) in diagonal rod bracing requiring retightening; minor lateral set at store fronts and other large openings; small cracks or wood splitting may be observed at bolted connections.

Extensive Structural Damage: Large diagonal cracks across shear wall panels; large slack in diagonal rod braces and/or broken braces; permanent lateral movement of floors and roof; cracks in foundations; splitting of wood sill plates and/or slippage of structure over foundations; partial collapse of "soft-story" configurations; bolt slippage and wood splitting at bolted connections.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure may have large permanent lateral displacement, may collapse or be in imminent danger of collapse due to failed shear walls, broken brace rods or failed framing connections; it may fall its foundations; large cracks in the

foundations. Approximately 3% of the total area of W2 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Steel Moment Frame (S1):

Slight Structural Damage: Minor deformations in connections or hairline cracks in few welds.

Moderate Structural Damage: Some steel members have yielded exhibiting observable permanent rotations at connections; few welded connections may exhibit major cracks through welds or few bolted connections may exhibit broken bolts or enlarged bolt holes.

Extensive Structural Damage: Most steel members have exceeded their yield capacity, resulting in significant permanent lateral deformation of the structure. Some of the structural members or connections may have exceeded their ultimate capacity exhibited by major permanent member rotations at connections, buckled flanges and failed connections. Partial collapse of portions of structure is possible due to failed critical elements and/or connections.

Complete Structural Damage: Significant portion of the structural elements have exceeded their ultimate capacities or some critical structural elements or connections have failed resulting in dangerous permanent lateral displacement, partial collapse or collapse of the building. Approximately 8 % (low-rise), 5% (mid-rise) or 3% (high-rise) of the total area of S1 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Steel Braced Frame (S2):

Slight Structural Damage: Few steel braces have yielded which may be indicated by minor stretching and/or buckling of slender brace members; minor cracks in welded connections; minor deformations in bolted brace connections.

Moderate Structural Damage: Some steel braces have yielded exhibiting observable stretching and/or buckling of braces; few braces, other members or connections have indications of reaching their ultimate capacity exhibited by buckled braces, cracked welds, or failed bolted connections.

Extensive Structural Damage: Most steel brace and other members have exceeded their yield capacity, resulting in significant permanent lateral deformation of the structure. Some structural members or connections have exceeded their ultimate capacity exhibited by buckled or broken braces, flange buckling, broken welds, or failed bolted connections. Anchor bolts at columns may be stretched. Partial collapse of portions of structure is possible due to failure of critical elements or connections.

Complete Structural Damage: Most the structural elements have reached their ultimate capacities or some critical members or connections have failed resulting in dangerous permanent lateral deflection, partial collapse or collapse of the building. Approximately
8% (low-rise), 5% (mid-rise) or 3% (high-rise) of the total area of S2 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Steel Light Frame (S3):

These structures are mostly single story structures combining rod-braced frames in one direction and moment frames in the other. Due to repetitive nature of the structural systems, the type of damage to structural members is expected to be rather uniform throughout the structure.

Slight Structural Damage: Few steel rod braces have yielded which may be indicated by minor sagging of rod braces. Minor cracking at welded connections or minor deformations at bolted connections of moment frames may be observed.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most steel braces have yielded exhibiting observable significantly sagging rod braces; few brace connections may be broken. Some weld cracking may be observed in the moment frame connections.

Extensive Structural Damage: Significant permanent lateral deformation of the structure due to broken brace rods, stretched anchor bolts and permanent deformations at moment frame members. Some screw or welded attachments of roof and wall siding to steel framing may be broken. Some purlin and girt connections may be broken.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure is collapsed or in imminent danger of collapse due to broken rod bracing, failed anchor bolts or failed structural members or connections. Approximately 3% of the total area of S3 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Steel Frame with Cast-In-Place Concrete Shear Walls (S4):

This is a "composite" structural system where primary lateral-force-resisting system is the concrete shear walls. Hence, Slight, Moderate and Extensive damage states are likely to be determined by the shear walls while the collapse damage state would be determined by the failure of the structural frame.

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal hairline cracks on most concrete shear wall surfaces; minor concrete spalling at few locations.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most shear wall surfaces exhibit diagonal cracks; some of the shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities exhibited by larger diagonal cracks and concrete spalling at wall ends.

Extensive Structural Damage: Most concrete shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities; few walls have reached or exceeded their ultimate capacity exhibited by large through-the wall diagonal cracks, extensive spalling around the cracks and visibly

buckled wall reinforcement. Partial collapse may occur due to failed connections of steel framing to concrete walls. Some damage may be observed in steel frame connections.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure may be in danger of collapse or collapse due to total failure of shear walls and loss of stability of the steel frames. Approximately 8% (low-rise), 5% (mid-rise) or 3% (high-rise) of the total area of S4 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Steel Frame with Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls (S5):

This is a "composite" structural system where the initial lateral resistance is provided by the infill walls. Upon cracking of the infills, further lateral resistance is provided by the steel frames "braced" by the infill walls acting as diagonal compression struts. Collapse of the structure results when the infill walls disintegrate (due to compression failure of the masonry "struts") and the steel frame loses its stability.

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal (sometimes horizontal) hairline cracks on most infill walls; cracks at frame-infill interfaces.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most infill wall surfaces exhibit larger diagonal or horizontal cracks; some walls exhibit crushing of brick around beam-column connections.

Extensive Structural Damage: Most infill walls exhibit large cracks; some bricks may be dislodged and fall; some infill walls may bulge out-of-plane; few walls may fall off partially or fully; some steel frame connections may have failed. Structure may exhibit permanent lateral deformation or partial collapse due to failure of some critical members.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure is collapsed or in danger of imminent collapse due to total failure of many infill walls and loss of stability of the steel frames. . Approximately 8% (low-rise), 5% (mid-rise) or 3% (high-rise) of the total area of S5 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Reinforced Concrete Moment Resisting Frames (C1):

Slight Structural Damage: Flexural or shear type hairline cracks in some beams and columns near joints or within joints.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most beams and columns exhibit hairline cracks. In ductile frames some of the frame elements have reached yield capacity indicated by larger flexural cracks and some concrete spalling. Nonductile frames may exhibit larger shear cracks and spalling.

Extensive Structural Damage: Some of the frame elements have reached their ultimate capacity indicated in ductile frames by large flexural cracks, spalled concrete and buckled main reinforcement; nonductile frame elements may have suffered shear failures or bond

failures at reinforcement splices, or broken ties or buckled main reinforcement in columns which may result in partial collapse.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure is collapsed or in imminent danger of collapse due to brittle failure of nonductile frame elements or loss of frame stability. Approximately 13% (low-rise), 10% (mid-rise) or 5% (high-rise) of the total area of C1 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Concrete Shear Walls (C2):

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal hairline cracks on most concrete shear wall surfaces; minor concrete spalling at few locations.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most shear wall surfaces exhibit diagonal cracks; some shear walls have exceeded yield capacity indicated by larger diagonal cracks and concrete spalling at wall ends.

Extensive Structural Damage: Most concrete shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities; some walls have exceeded their ultimate capacities indicated by large, through-the-wall diagonal cracks, extensive spalling around the cracks and visibly buckled wall reinforcement or rotation of narrow walls with inadequate foundations. Partial collapse may occur due to failure of nonductile columns not designed to resist lateral loads.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure has collapsed or is in imminent danger of collapse due to failure of most of the shear walls and failure of some critical beams or columns. Approximately 13% (low-rise), 10% (mid-rise) or 5% (high-rise) of the total area of C2 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Concrete Frame Buildings with Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls (C3):

This is a "composite" structural system where the initial lateral resistance is provided by the infill walls. Upon cracking of the infills, further lateral resistance is provided by the concrete frame "braced" by the infill acting as diagonal compression struts. Collapse of the structure results when the infill walls disintegrate (due to compression failure of the masonry "struts") and the frame loses stability, or when the concrete columns suffer shear failures due to reduced effective height and the high shear forces imposed on them by the masonry compression struts.

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal (sometimes horizontal) hairline cracks on most infill walls; cracks at frame-infill interfaces.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most infill wall surfaces exhibit larger diagonal or horizontal cracks; some walls exhibit crushing of brick around beam-column connections. Diagonal shear cracks may be observed in concrete beams or columns.

Extensive Structural Damage: Most infill walls exhibit large cracks; some bricks may dislodge and fall; some infill walls may bulge out-of-plane; few walls may fall partially or fully; few concrete columns or beams may fail in shear resulting in partial collapse. Structure may exhibit permanent lateral deformation.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure has collapsed or is in imminent danger of collapse due to a combination of total failure of the infill walls and nonductile failure of the concrete beams and columns. Approximately 15% (low-rise), 13% (mid-rise) or 5% (high-rise) of the total area of C3 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Precast Concrete Tilt-Up Walls (PC1):

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal hairline cracks on concrete shear wall surfaces; larger cracks around door and window openings in walls with large proportion of openings; minor concrete spalling at few locations; minor separation of walls from the floor and roof diaphragms; hairline cracks around metal connectors between wall panels and at connections of beams to walls.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most wall surfaces exhibit diagonal cracks; larger cracks in walls with door or window openings; few shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities indicated by larger diagonal cracks and concrete spalling. Cracks may appear at top of walls near panel intersections indicating "chord" yielding. Some walls may have visibly pulled away from the roof. Some welded panel connections may have been broken, indicated by spalled concrete around connections. Some spalling may be observed at the connections of beams to walls.

Extensive Structural Damage: In buildings with relatively large area of wall openings most concrete shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities and some have exceeded their ultimate capacities indicated by large, through-the-wall diagonal cracks, extensive spalling around the cracks and visibly buckled wall reinforcement. The plywood diaphragms may exhibit cracking and separation along plywood joints. Partial collapse of the roof may result from the failure of the wall-to-diaphragm anchorages sometimes with falling of wall panels.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure is collapsed or is in imminent danger of collapse due to failure of the wall-to-roof anchorages, splitting of ledgers, or failure of plywood-to-ledger nailing; failure of beams connections at walls; failure of roof or floor diaphragms; or, failure of the wall panels. Approximately 15% of the total area of PC1 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Precast Concrete Frames with Concrete Shear Walls (PC2):

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal hairline cracks on most shear wall surfaces; minor concrete spalling at few connections of precast members.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most shear wall surfaces exhibit diagonal cracks; some shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities indicated by larger cracks and concrete spalling at wall ends; observable distress or movement at connections of precast frame connections, some failures at metal inserts and welded connections.

Extensive Structural Damage: Most concrete shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities; some walls may have reached their ultimate capacities indicated by large, through-the wall diagonal cracks, extensive spalling around the cracks and visibly buckled wall reinforcement. Some critical precast frame connections may have failed resulting partial collapse.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure has collapsed or is in imminent danger of collapse due to failure of the shear walls and/or failures at precast frame connections. Approximately 15% (low-rise), 13% (mid-rise) or 10% (high-rise) of the total area of PC2 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with Wood or Metal Deck Diaphragms (RM1):

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal hairline cracks on masonry wall surfaces; larger cracks around door and window openings in walls with large proportion of openings; minor separation of walls from the floor and roof diaphragms.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most wall surfaces exhibit diagonal cracks; some of the shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities indicated by larger diagonal cracks. Some walls may have visibly pulled away from the roof.

Extensive Structural Damage: In buildings with relatively large area of wall openings most shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities and some of the walls have exceeded their ultimate capacities indicated by large, through-the-wall diagonal cracks and visibly buckled wall reinforcement. The plywood diaphragms may exhibit cracking and separation along plywood joints. Partial collapse of the roof may result from failure of the wall-to-diaphragm anchorages or the connections of beams to walls.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure has collapsed or is in imminent danger of collapse due to failure of the wall anchorages or due to failure of the wall panels. Approximately 13% (low-rise) or 10% (mid-rise) of the total area of RM1 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Reinforced Masonry Bearing Walls with Precast Concrete Diaphragms (RM2):

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal hairline cracks on masonry wall surfaces; larger cracks around door and window openings in walls with large proportion of openings.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most wall surfaces exhibit diagonal cracks; some of the shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities indicated by larger cracks.

Extensive Structural Damage: In buildings with relatively large area of wall openings most shear walls have exceeded their yield capacities and some of the walls have exceeded their ultimate capacities exhibited by large, through-the wall diagonal cracks and visibly buckled wall reinforcement. The diaphragms may also exhibit cracking.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure is collapsed or is in imminent danger of collapse due to failure of the walls. Approximately 13% (low-rise), 10% (mid-rise) or 5% (high-rise) of the total area of RM2 buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Walls (URM):

Slight Structural Damage: Diagonal, stair-step hairline cracks on masonry wall surfaces; larger cracks around door and window openings in walls with large proportion of openings; movements of lintels; cracks at the base of parapets.

Moderate Structural Damage: Most wall surfaces exhibit diagonal cracks; some of the walls exhibit larger diagonal cracks; masonry walls may have visible separation from diaphragms; significant cracking of parapets; some masonry may fall from walls or parapets.

Extensive Structural Damage: In buildings with relatively large area of wall openings most walls have suffered extensive cracking. Some parapets and gable end walls have fallen. Beams or trusses may have moved relative to their supports.

Complete Structural Damage: Structure has collapsed or is in imminent danger of collapse due to in-plane or out-of-plane failure of the walls. Approximately 15% of the total area of URM buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

<u>Mobile Homes (MH):</u>

Slight Structural Damage: Damage to some porches, stairs or other attached components.

Moderate Structural Damage: Major movement of the mobile home over its supports resulting in some damage to metal siding and stairs and requiring resetting of the mobile home on its supports.

Extensive Structural Damage: Mobile home has fallen partially off its supports, often severing utility lines.

Complete Structural Damage: Mobile home has totally fallen off its supports; usually severing utility lines, with steep jack stands penetrating through the floor. Approximately 3% of the total area of MH buildings with Complete damage is expected to be collapsed.

1.4.2 Nonstructural Damage

Four damage states are used to describe nonstructural damage: Slight, Moderate, Extensive and Complete nonstructural damage. Nonstructural damage is considered to be independent of the structural model building type (i.e. partitions, ceilings, cladding, etc. are assumed to incur the same damage when subjected to the same interstory drift or floor acceleration whether they are in a steel frame building or in a concrete shear wall building), consequently, building-specific damage state descriptions are not meaningful. Instead, general descriptions of nonstructural damage states are provided for common nonstructural systems.

Damage to drift-sensitive nonstructural components is primarily a function of interstory drift (e.g. full-height drywall partitions) while for acceleration-sensitive components (e.g. mechanical equipment) damage is a function of the floor acceleration. Developing fragility curves for each possible nonstructural component is not practicable for the purposes of regional loss estimation and there is insufficient data to develop such fragility curves. Hence, in this methodology nonstructural building components are grouped into drift-sensitive and acceleration-sensitive component groups, and the damage functions estimated for each group are assumed to be "typical" of it sub-components. Note, however, that damage depends on the anchorage/bracing provided to the nonstructural components. Damageability characteristics of each group are described by a set of fragility curves (see Subsection 5.4.3.3).

The type of nonstructural components in a given building is a function of the building occupancy-use classification. For example, single-family residences would not have curtain wall panels, suspended ceilings, elevators, etc. while these items would be found in an office building. Hence, the relative values of nonstructural components in relation to the overall building replacement value vary with type of occupancy. In Chapter 15, estimates of replacement cost breakdown between structural building components for different occupancy/use related classifications are provided; further breakdowns are provided by drift- and acceleration-sensitive nonstructural components.

In the following, general descriptions of the four nonstructural damage states are described for common nonstructural building components:

Partitions Walls

Slight Nonstructural Damage: A few cracks are observed at intersections of walls and ceilings and at corners of door openings.

Moderate Nonstructural Damage: Larger and more extensive cracks requiring repair and repainting; some partitions may require replacement of gypsum board or other finishes. **Extensive Nonstructural Damage:** Most of the partitions are cracked and a significant portion may require replacement of finishes; some door frames in the partitions are also damaged and require re-setting.

Complete Nonstructural Damage: Most partition finish materials and framing may have to be removed and replaced; damaged studs repaired, and walls refinished. Most door frames may also have to be repaired and replaced.

Suspended Ceilings

Slight Nonstructural Damage: A few ceiling tiles have moved or fallen down.

Moderate Nonstructural Damage: Falling of tiles is more extensive; in addition the ceiling support framing (T-bars) has disconnected and/or buckled at few locations; lenses have fallen off of some light fixtures and a few fixtures have fallen; localized repairs are necessary.

Extensive Nonstructural Damage: The ceiling system exhibits extensive buckling, disconnected t-bars and falling ceiling tiles; ceiling partially collapses at few locations and some light fixtures fall; repair typically involves removal of most or all ceiling tiles.

Complete Nonstructural Damage: The ceiling system is buckled throughout and/or fallen and requires complete replacement; many light fixtures fall.

Exterior Wall Panels

Slight Nonstructural Damage: Slight movement of the panels, requiring realignment.

Moderate Nonstructural Damage: The movements are more extensive; connections of panels to structural frame are damaged requiring further inspection and repairs; some window frames may need realignment.

Extensive Nonstructural Damage: Most of the panels are cracked or otherwise damaged and misaligned, and most panel connections to the structural frame are damaged requiring thorough review and repairs; few panels fall or are in imminent danger of falling; some window panes are broken and some pieces of glass have fallen.

Complete Nonstructural Damage: Most panels are severely damaged, most connections are broken or severely damaged, some panels have fallen and most are in imminent danger of falling; extensive glass breakage and falling.

Electrical-Mechanical Equipment, Piping, Ducts

Slight Nonstructural Damage: The most vulnerable equipment (e.g. unanchored or on spring isolators) moves and damages attached piping or ducts.

Moderate Nonstructural Damage: Movements are larger and damage is more extensive; piping leaks at few locations; elevator machinery and rails may require realignment.

Extensive Nonstructural Damage: Equipment on spring isolators topples and falls; other unanchored equipment slides or falls breaking connections to piping and ducts; leaks develop at many locations; anchored equipment indicate stretched bolts or strain at anchorages.

Complete Nonstructural Damage: Equipment is damaged by sliding, overturning or failure of their supports and is not operable; piping is leaking at many locations; some pipe and duct supports have failed causing pipes and ducts to fall or hang down; elevator rails are buckled or have broken supports and/or counterweights have derailed.

2. Essential Facilities

2.1. Description of Essential Facilities

Essential facilities are those facilities that provide services to the community and should be functional after an earthquake. Essential facilities include hospitals, police stations, fire stations and schools. The damage state probabilities for essential facilities are determined on a site-specific basis (i.e., the ground motion parameters are computed at the location of the facility).

2.2. Description of Building Damage States for Essential Facilities

Building damage states for structural and nonstructural components of essential facilities are the same as those described in Chapter 1 for general building stock.

3. Transportation Systems

Transportation systems include the following seven systems: Highways, Railways, Light Rails, Bus Facilities, Ports, Ferry and Airports

3.1. Highways Transportation System:

This system consists of roadways, bridges and tunnels.

3.1.1. Description of Highway Components

In this section, a brief description of each highway component is given.

<u>Roadways</u>

Roadways are classified as major roads and urban roads. Major roads include interstate and state highways and other roads with four lanes or more. Parkways are also classified as major roads. Urban roads include intercity roads and other roads with two lanes.

Bridges

Bridges are classified based on the following structural characteristics:

- Seismic Design
- Number of spans: single vs. multiple span bridges
- Structure type: concrete, steel, others
- Pier type: multiple column bents, single column bents and pier walls
- Abutment type and bearing type: monolithic vs. non-monolithic; high rocker bearings, low steel bearings and neoprene rubber bearings
- Span continuity: continuous, discontinuous (in-span hinges), and simply supported.

<u>Tunnels</u>

Tunnels are classified as bored/drilled or cut & cover.

3.1.2. Definition of Damage States of Highway Components

A total of five damage states are defined for highway system components. These are none, slight/minor, moderate, extensive and complete.

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For **roadways**, DS2 is defined by slight settlement (few inches) or offset of the ground.
- For **bridges**, DS2 is defined by minor cracking and spalling to the abutment, cracks in shear keys at abutments, minor spalling and cracks at hinges, minor spalling at the column (damage requires no more than cosmetic repair) or minor cracking to the deck.
- For **tunnels**, DS2 is defined by minor cracking of the tunnel liner (damage requires no more than cosmetic repair) and some rock falling, or by slight settlement of the ground at a tunnel portal.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For **roadways**, DS3 is defined by moderate settlement (several inches) or offset of the ground.
- For **bridges**, DS3 is defined by any column experiencing moderate (shear cracks) cracking and spalling (column structurally still sound), moderate movement of the abutment (<2"), extensive cracking and spalling of shear keys, any connection having cracked shear keys or bent bolts, keeper bar failure without unseating, rocker bearing failure or moderate settlement of the approach.
- For tunnels, DS3 is defined by moderate cracking of the tunnel liner and rock falling.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For roadways, DS4 is defined by major settlement of the ground (few feet).
- For **bridges**, DS4 is defined by any column degrading without collapse shear failure (column structurally unsafe), significant residual movement at connections, or major settlement approach, vertical offset of the abutment, differential settlement at connections, shear key failure at abutments.
- For **tunnels**, DS4 is characterized by major ground settlement at a tunnel portal and extensive cracking of the tunnel liner.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For roadways, DS5 is defined by major settlement of the ground (i.e., same as DS4).
- For **bridges**, DS5 is defined by any column collapsing and connection losing all bearing support, which may lead to imminent deck collapse, tilting of substructure due to foundation failure.
- For **tunnels**, DS5 is characterized by major cracking of the tunnel liner, which may include possible collapse.

3.1.3. Functionality of Highway Components

Component functionality is described by the probability of damage state (immediately following the earthquake) and by the associated fraction or percentage of the component that is expected to be functional after a specified period of time. For example, a roadway link might be found to have a 0.50 probability of extensive damage and on this basis would have a 0.50 probability that the road would be: (1) closed immediately, (2) partially open after a 3-day restoration period and (3) fully open after a 1-month restoration period.

3.2. Railway Transportation System:

This system consists of tracks/roadbeds, bridges, tunnels, urban stations, maintenance facilities, fuel facilities, and dispatch facilities.

3.2.1. Description of Railway System Components

A railway system consists of four components: tracks/roadbeds, bridges, tunnels, and facilities.

Tracks/Roadbeds

Tracks/roadbeds refers to the assembly of rails, ties, and fastenings, and the ground on which they rest. Only one classification is adopted for these components. This classification is analogous to that of urban roads in highway systems.

Bridges

Railway bridges are classified similar to highway steel and concrete bridges.

Tunnels

Railway tunnels follow the same classification as highway tunnels. That is, they are classified either as bored/drilled tunnels or cut & cover tunnels.

Railway System Facilities

Railway system facilities include urban and suburban stations, maintenance facilities, fuel facilities, and dispatch facilities.

Urban and Suburban stations are generally key connecting hubs that are important for system functionality. In western US, these buildings are mostly made of reinforced concrete shear walls or moment resisting steel frames, while in the eastern US, the small stations are mostly wood and the large ones are mostly masonry or braced steel frames.

Maintenance facilities are housed in large structures that are not usually critical for system functionality as maintenance activities can be delayed or performed elsewhere. These building structures are often made of steel braced frames.

Fuel facilities include buildings, tanks (anchored, unanchored, or buried), backup power systems (if available, anchored or unanchored diesel generators), pumps, and other equipment (anchored or unanchored). It should be mentioned that anchored equipment in general refers to equipment designed with special seismic tiedowns or tiebacks, while unanchored equipment refers to equipment designed with no special considerations other than the manufacturer's normal requirements. While some vibrating components, such as

pumps, are bolted down regardless of concern for earthquakes, as used here "anchored" means all components have been engineered to meet seismic criteria which may include bracing (e.g., pipe or stack bracing) or flexibility requirements (e.g., flexible connections across separation joints) as well as anchorage. These definitions of anchored and unanchored apply to all lifeline components. The fuel facility functionality is determined with a fault tree analysis considering redundancies and subcomponent behavior. Note that generic building damage functions are used in this fault tree analysis for developing the overall fragility curve of fuel facilities. Above ground tanks are typically made of steel with roofs also made of steel. Buried tanks are typically concrete wall construction with concrete roofs. In total, five types of fuel facilities are considered. These are: fuel facilities with or without anchored equipment and with or without backup power (all combinations), and fuel facilities with buried tanks.

Dispatch facilities consist of buildings, backup power supplies (if available, anchored or unanchored diesel generators), and electrical equipment (anchored or unanchored). Generic reinforced concrete building with shear walls damage functions, are used in this fault tree analysis for developing the overall fragility curves for dispatch facilities. In total, four types of dispatch facilities are considered. These are dispatch facilities with or without anchored equipment and with or without backup power (all combinations).

3.2.2. Definitions of Damage States of Railway System Components

A total of five damage states are defined for railway system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

<u>Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)</u>

- For **tracks and roadbeds**, DS2 is defined by minor (localized) derailment due to slight differential settlement of embankment or offset of the ground.
- For **railway bridges**, DS2 is defined similar to highway bridges.
- For **railway tunnels**, DS2 is defined similar to highway tunnels.
- For railway system facilities:
- For **urban stations** and **maintenance facilities**, DS2 is defined by slight building damage (check chapter 1 for full description of potential damage).
- For **fuel facilities with anchored equipment**, DS2 is defined by slight damage to pump building, minor damage to anchor of tanks, or loss of off-site power (check electric power systems for more on this) for a very short period and minor damage to backup power (i.e. to diesel generators, if available).

- For **fuel facilities with unanchored equipment**, DS2 is defined by elephant foot buckling of tanks with no leakage or loss of contents, slight damage to pump building, or loss of commercial power for a very short period and minor damage to backup power (i.e. to diesel generators, if available).
- For **fuel facilities with buried tanks** (PGD related damage), DS2 is defined by minor uplift (few inches) of the buried tanks or minor cracking of concrete walls.
- For **dispatch facilities with anchored equipment**, DS2 is defined by minor anchor damage, slight damage to building, or loss of commercial power for a very short period and minor damage to backup power (i.e. diesel generators, if available).
- For **dispatch facilities with unanchored equipment**, DS2 is defined by loss of offsite power for a very short period and minor damage to backup power (i.e. to diesel generators, if available), or slight damage to building.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For **railway tracks** and **roadbeds**, DS3 is defined by considerable derailment due to differential settlement or offset of the ground. Rail repair is required.
- For railway bridges, DS3 is defined as for highway bridges.
- For **railway tunnels**, DS3 is defined as for highway tunnels.
- For railway system facilities:
- For **urban stations** and **maintenance facilities**, DS3 is defined by moderate building damage (check Chapter 1 for description of potential damage).
- For **fuel facilities with anchored equipment**, DS3 is defined by elephant foot buckling of tanks with no leakage or loss of contents, considerable damage to equipment, moderate damage to pump building, or loss of commercial power for few days and malfunction of backup power (i.e., diesel generators, if available).
- For **fuel facilities with unanchored equipment**, DS3 is defined by elephant foot buckling of tanks with partial loss of contents, moderate damage to pump building, loss of commercial power for few days and malfunction of backup power (i.e., diesel generators, if available).
- For **fuel facilities with buried tanks**, DS3 is defined by damage to roof supporting columns, and considerable cracking of walls.
- For **dispatch facilities with anchored equipment**, DS3 is defined by considerable anchor damage, moderate damage to building, or loss of commercial power for few days and malfunction of backup power (i.e., diesel generators, if available).

• For **dispatch facilities with unanchored equipment**, DS3 is defined by moderate damage to building, or loss of off-site power for few days and malfunction of backup power (i.e., diesel generators, if available).

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For railway tracks/roadbeds, DS4 is defined by major differential settlement of the ground resulting in potential derailment over extended length.
- For railway bridges, DS4 is defined the same as it is for highway bridges.
- For railway tunnels, DS4 is defined the same as it is for highway tunnels.
- For railway system facilities:
- For urban stations and maintenance facilities, DS4 is defined by extensive building damage (check Chapter 1 for description of potential damage).
- For fuel facilities with anchored equipment, DS4 is defined by elephant foot buckling of tanks with loss of contents, extensive damage to pumps (cracked/sheared shafts), or extensive damage to pump building.
- For fuel facilities with unanchored equipment, DS4 is defined by weld failure at base of tank with loss of contents, extensive damage to pump building, or extensive damage to pumps (cracked/sheared shafts).
- For fuel facilities with buried tanks, DS4 is defined by considerable uplift (more than a foot) of the tanks and rupture of the attached piping.
- For dispatch facilities with unanchored or anchored equipment, DS4 is defined by extensive building damage.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For railway tracks/roadbeds, DS5 is the same as DS4.
- For railway bridges, DS5 is defined the same as it is for highway bridges.
- For **railway tunnels**, DS5 is defined the same as it is for highway tunnels.
- For railway system facilities:
- For **urban stations** and **maintenance facilities**, DS5 is defined by extensive to complete building damage (check Chapter 1 for description of potential damage).

- For **fuel facilities with anchored equipment**, DS5 is defined by weld failure at base of tank with loss of contents, or extensive to complete damage to pump building.
- For **fuel facilities with unanchored equipment**, DS5 is defined by tearing of tank wall or implosion of tank (with total loss of content), or extensive/complete damage to pump building.
- For **fuel facilities with buried tanks**, DS5 is same as DS4.
- For **dispatch facilities with unanchored or anchored equipment**, DS5 is defined by complete damage to building.

3.2.3. Functionality of Railway System Components

Component functionality is described similar to highway system components, that is, by the probability of being in a damage state (immediately following the earthquake) and by the associated fraction or percentage of the component that is expected to be functional after a specified period of time.

3.3. Light Rail Transportation System

3.3.1. Description of Light Rail Systems

Like railway systems, light rail systems consist of railway tracks/roadbeds, bridges, tunnels, maintenance facilities, dispatch facilities and DC power substations. The first five are the same as for railway systems and are already described in Section 3.2.1. Therefore, only DC substations will be described in this subsection.

DC Power Substations

Light rail systems use electric power and have low voltage DC power substations. DC power is used by the light rail system's electrical distribution system. The DC power substations consist of electrical equipment, which convert the local electric utility AC power to DC power. Two types of DC power stations are considered. These are: (1) DC power stations with anchored (seismically designed) components and (2) DC power stations with unanchored (which are not seismically designed) components.

3.3.2 Definitions of Damage States of Light Rail Systems

A total of five damage states are defined for light rail system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight or Minor Damage (DS2)

- For tracks/roadbeds, DS2 is defined similar to railway tracks.
- For **light rail bridges**, DS2 is defined similar to railway bridges.
- For light rail tunnels, DS2 is defined similar to highway tunnels.
- For light rail system facilities:
- For maintenance facilities, DS2 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS2 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.
- For **DC** power substations with anchored or unanchored components, DS2 is defined by loss of off-site power for a very short period, or slight damage to building.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For tracks/roadbeds, DS3 is defined similar to railway tracks.
- For **light rail bridges**, DS3 is defined similar to railway bridges.
- For light rail tunnels, DS3 is defined similar to highway tunnels.
- For light rail system facilities:
- For maintenance facilities, DS3 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS3 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.
- For **DC** power substations with anchored or unanchored components, DS3 is defined by loss of off-site power for few days, considerable damage to equipment, or moderate damage to building.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For tracks/roadbeds, DS4 is defined similar to railway tracks.
- For **light rail bridges**, DS4 is defined similar to railway bridges.
- For **light rail tunnels**, DS4 is defined similar to highway tunnels.
- For light rail system facilities:
- For maintenance facilities, DS4 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.

- For **dispatch facilities**, DS4 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.
- For **DC power substations with anchored or unanchored components**, DS4 is defined by extensive building damage.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For tracks/roadbeds, DS5 is defined similar to railway tracks.
- For light rail bridges, DS5 is defined similar to railway bridges.
- For light rail tunnels, DS5 is defined similar to highway tunnels.
- For light rail system facilities:
- For maintenance facilities, DS5 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.
- For dispatch facilities, DS5 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.
- For DC power substations with anchored or unanchored components, DS5 is defined by complete building damage.

3.3.3. Functionality of Light Rail Systems

Component functionality is described by the probability of damage state (immediately following the earthquake) and by the associated fraction or percentage of the component that is expected to be functional after a specified period of time.

3.4. Bus Transportation System

3.4.1. Description of Bus System Components

A bus system consists mainly of four components: urban stations, fuel facilities, maintenance facilities, and dispatch facilities. Major losses can occur if bus maintenance buildings collapse and operational problems may arise if a dispatch facility is damaged. This section provides a brief description of each component.

Urban Stations

These are mainly buildings structures.

Bus System Fuel Facilities

Fuel facility consists of fuel storage tanks, buildings, pump equipment and buried pipe, and, sometimes, backup power. The fuel facility functionality is determined with a fault tree analysis considering redundancies and sub-component behavior. The same classes assumed for railway fuel facilities are assumed here.

Bus System Maintenance Facilities

Maintenance facilities for bus systems are mostly made of steel braced frames. The same classes assumed for railway maintenance facilities are assumed here.

Bus System Dispatch Facilities

The same classes assumed for railway dispatch facilities are assumed here.

3.4.2 Definitions of Damage States of Bus System Components

Damage states describing the level of damage to each of the bus system components are defined (i.e. slight, moderate, extensive or complete). Damage states are related to damage ratio (defined as ratio of repair to replacement cost) for evaluation of direct economic loss.

For bus systems, the restoration is dependent upon the extent of damage to the fuel, maintenance, and dispatch facilities.

3.4.3 Definitions of Damage States of Bus System Components

A total of five damage states are defined for bus system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight Damage (DS2)

- For **urban stations**, DS2 is defined similar to railway urban stations.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS2 is defined similar to railway fuel facilities.
- For maintenance facilities, DS2 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS2 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For **urban stations**, DS3 is defined similar to railway urban stations.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS3 is defined similar to railway fuel facilities.

- For maintenance facilities, DS3 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS3 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For **urban stations**, DS4 is defined similar to railway urban stations.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS4 is defined similar to railway fuel facilities.
- For maintenance facilities, DS4 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS4 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For **urban stations**, DS5 is defined similar to railway urban stations.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS5 is defined similar to railway fuel facilities.
- For maintenance facilities, DS5 is defined similar to railway maintenance facilities.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS5 is defined similar to railway dispatch facilities.

3.4.4. Functionality of Bus Transportation Systems

Component functionality is described by the probability of being in a damage state (immediately following the earthquake) and by the associated fraction or percentage of the component that is expected to be functional after a specified period of time.

3.5. Port Transportation Systems

3.5.1. Description of Port Transportation Systems

A port system consists of four components: waterfront structures, cranes/cargo handling equipment, fuel facilities, and warehouses. In many cases, these facilities were constructed prior to widespread use of engineered fills; consequently, the wharf, pier, and seawall structures are prone to damage due to soil failures such as liquefaction. This section provides a brief description of each.

Waterfront Structures

This component includes wharves (port embankments), seawalls (protective walls from erosion), and piers (break-water structures which form harbors) that exist in the port system. Waterfront structures typically are supported by wood, steel or concrete piles. Many also have batter piles to resist lateral loads from wave action and impact of vessels. Seawalls are caisson walls retaining earth fill material.

Cranes and Cargo Handling Equipment

These are large equipment items used to load and unload freight from vessels. These are can be stationary or mounted on rails.

Port Fuel Facilities

The fuel facility consists mainly of fuel storage tanks, buildings, pump equipment, piping, and, sometimes, backup power. These are the same as those for railway systems presented in Section 3.2.1.

Warehouses

Warehouses are large buildings usually constructed of structural steel. In some cases, warehouses may be several hundred feet from the shoreline, while in other instances; they may be located on the wharf itself.

3.5.2. Definition of Damage States of Port Transportation Systems

A total of five damage states are defined for port system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For waterfront structures, DS2 is defined by minor ground settlement resulting in few piles (for piers/seawalls) getting broken and damaged. Cracks are formed on the surface of the wharf. Repair may be needed.
- For **cranes/cargo handling equipment**, DS2 is defined by slight damage to structural members with no loss of function for the stationary equipment, while for the unanchored or rail mounted equipment, DS1 is defined as minor derailment or misalignment without any major structural damage to the rail mount. Minor repair and adjustments may be required before the crane becomes operable.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS2 is defined the same as it is for railway facilities.
- For warehouses, DS2 is defined by slight damage to the warehouse building.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For waterfront structures, DS3 is defined as considerable ground settlement with several piles (for piers/seawalls) getting broken and damaged.
- For **cranes/cargo handling equipment**, DS3 is defined as derailment due to differential displacement of parallel track. Rail repair and some repair to structural members is required.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS3 is defined the same as it is for railway facilities.
- For warehouses, DS3 is defined by moderate damage to the warehouse building.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For waterfront structures, DS4 is defined by failure of many piles, extensive sliding of piers, and significant ground settlement causing extensive cracking of pavements.
- For **cranes/cargo handling equipment**, DS4 is defined by considerable damage to equipment. Toppled or totally derailed cranes are likely to occur. Replacement of structural members is required.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS4 is defined same as for railway facilities.
- For warehouses, DS4 is defined by extensive damage to warehouse building.

3.5.3. Functionality of Port Transportation Systems

For ports the restoration is dependent upon the extent of damage to the waterfront structures, cranes/cargo handling equipment, fuel facilities, and warehouses. From the standpoint of functionality of the port, the user should consider the restoration of only the waterfront structures and cranes since the fuel facilities and warehouses are not as critical to the functionality of the port.

3.6. Ferry Transportation System

3.6.1. Description of Ferry System Components

A ferry system consists of five components: waterfront structures, fuel facilities, maintenance facilities, dispatch facilities, and passenger terminals. This section provides a brief description of each.

Waterfront Structures

The waterfront structures are located at the points of embarkation or disembarkation, and they are similar to, although not as extensive as, those of the port transportation system described in Section 3.5.1.

Fuel Facilities

These facilities are usually located at one of the two points of embarkation and they are similar to those for port system mentioned in Section 3.5.1.

Maintenance Facilities

These facilities are usually located at one of the two points of embarkation and they are often steel braced frame structures, but other building types are possible.

Dispatch Facilities

These facilities are usually located at one of the two points of embarkation and they are similar to those defined for railway system in Section 3.2.1.

Passenger Terminals

These facilities are usually located at one of the two points of embarkation and they are often moment resisting steel frames, but other building types are possible.

3.6.2. Definitions of Ferry System Components

A total of five damage states are defined for ferry system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For waterfront structures, DS2 is the same as that for waterfront structures in the port module.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS2 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the port module.
- For maintenance facilities, DS2 is defined by slight damage to building.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS2 is the same as that for dispatch facilities in the railway module.
- For **passenger terminals**, DS2 is defined by slight damage to building.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For waterfront structures, DS3 is the same as that for waterfront structures in the port module.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS3 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the port module.
- For maintenance facilities, DS3 is defined by moderate damage to building.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS3 is the same as that for dispatch facilities in the railway module.
- For **passenger terminals**, DS3 is defined by moderate damage to building.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For waterfront structures, DS4 is the same as that for waterfront structures in the port module.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS4 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the port module.
- For maintenance facilities, DS4 is defined by extensive damage to building.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS4 is the same as that for dispatch facilities in the railway
- module.
- For **passenger terminals**, DS4 is defined by extensive damage to building.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For waterfront structures, DS5 is the same as that for waterfront structures in the port module.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS5 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the port module.
- For maintenance facilities, DS5 is defined by complete damage to building.
- For **dispatch facilities**, DS5 is the same as that for dispatch facilities in the railway module.
- For **passenger terminals**, DS5 is defined as complete damage to building.

3.6.3. Functionality of Ferry System Components

Restoration curves describe the fraction or percentage of the component that is expected to be open or operational as a function of time following the earthquake. For ferries the restoration is dependent upon the extent of damage to the waterfront structures; fuel, maintenance, and dispatch facilities; and passenger terminals.

Interdependence of components on overall system functionality is not addressed by the methodology. Such considerations require a system (network) analysis that would be performed separately by a transportation system expert as an advanced study.

3.7. Airport Transportation System

3.7.1. Description of Airport Components

An airport system consists of the six components mentioned above: runways, control tower, fuel facilities, maintenance facilities, and parking structures. For airports, control towers are often constructed of reinforced concrete, while terminal buildings and maintenance facilities are often constructed of structural steel or reinforced concrete. This section provides a brief description of each.

Runways

This component consists of well-paved "flat and wide surfaces".

Control Tower

Control tower consists of a building and the necessary equipment of air control and monitoring.

Fuel Facilities

These have been previously defined in Section 3.2.1. of railway systems.

Terminal Buildings

These are similar to urban stations of railway systems from the classification standpoint (as well as services provided to passengers).

Maintenance Facilities, Hangar Facilities, and Parking Structures

Classification of maintenance facilities is the same as for those in railway systems. Hangar facilities and parking structures are mainly composed of buildings.

3.7.2. Definitions of Damage States

A total of five damage states are defined for airport system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For **runways**, DS2 is defined as minor ground settlement or heaving of runway surface.
- For **control tower**, DS2 is defined as slight damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS2 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the railway module.
- For **terminal buildings**, DS2 is defined as slight damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **maintenance and hangar facilities**, DS2 is defined as slight damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **parking structures**, DS2 is defined as slight damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For **runways**, DS3 is defined same as DS2.
- For **control tower**, DS3 is defined as moderate damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS3 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the railway module.
- For **terminal buildings**, DS3 is defined as moderate damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **maintenance and hangar facilities**, DS3 is defined as moderate damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **parking structures**, DS3 is defined as moderate damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

• For **runways**, DS4 is defined as considerable ground settlement or considerable heaving of runway surface.

- For **control tower**, DS4 is defined as extensive damage to the building as given in section 5.3.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS4 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the railway module.
- For **terminal buildings**, DS4 is defined as extensive damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **maintenance and hangar facilities**, DS4 is defined as extensive damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **parking structures**, DS4 is defined as extensive damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For **runways**, DS5 is defined as extensive ground settlement or excessive heaving of runway surface.
- For **control tower**, DS5 is defined as complete damage to the building as given in section 5.3.
- For **fuel facilities**, DS5 is the same as that for fuel facilities in the railway module.
- For **terminal buildings**, DS5 is defined as complete damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **maintenance and hangar facilities**, DS5 is defined as complete damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.
- For **parking structures**, DS5 is defined as complete damage to the building as given in Section 1.4.

3.7.3. Definition of Functionality of Highway Components

Component restoration curves are provided for each damage state to evaluate loss of function. Restoration curves describe the fraction or percentage of the component that is expected to be open or operational as a function of time following the earthquake. For airports, the restoration is dependent upon the extent of damage to the airport terminals, buildings, storage tanks (for fuel facilities), control tower, and runways.

4. Utility Systems

The Utility Module is composed of the following six systems:

- Potable Water
- Waste Water
- Oil (crude and refined)
- Natural Gas
- Electric Power
- Communication

4.1. Potable Water Systems

This system consists of supply, storage, transmission, and distribution components. All of these components are vulnerable to damage during earthquakes, which may result in a significant disruption to the water utility network.

4.1.1 Description of Potable Water System Components

A potable water system typically consists of terminal reservoirs, water treatment plants, wells, pumping plants, storage tanks and transmission and distribution pipelines. In this subsection, a brief description of each of these components is presented.

Terminal Reservoirs

Terminal reservoirs are typically lakes (man made or natural) and are usually located nearby and upstream of the water treatment plant. Vulnerability of terminal reservoirs and associated dams is marginally assessed in the loss estimation methodology. Therefore, even though reservoirs are an essential part of a potable water system, it is assumed in the analysis of water systems that the amount of water flowing into water treatment plants from reservoirs right after an earthquake is essentially the same as before the earthquake.

Transmission Aqueducts

These transmission conduits are typically large size pipes (more than 20 inches in diameter) or channels (canals) that convey water from its source (reservoirs, lakes, rivers) to the treatment plant. Transmission pipelines are commonly made of concrete, ductile iron, cast iron, or steel. These could be elevated/at grade or buried. Elevated or at grade pipes are typically made of steel (welded or riveted), and they can run in single or multiple lines. Canals are typically lined with concrete, mainly to avoid excessive loss of water by seepage and to control erosion. In addition to concrete lining, expansion joints are usually used to account for swelling and shrinkage under varying temperature and moisture conditions. Damageability of channels has occurred in some earthquake, but is outside the scope of the scope of the methodology.

Supply Facilities- Water Treatment Plants (WTP)

Water treatment plants are generally composed of a number of physical and chemical unit processes connected in series, for the purpose of improving the water quality. A conventional WTP consists of a coagulation process, followed by a sedimentation process, and finally a filtration process. Alternately, a WTP can be regarded as a system of interconnected pipes, basins, and channels through which the water moves, and where the flow is governed by hydraulic principles. WTP are categorized as follows:

Small water treatment plants, with capacity ranging from 10 mgd to 50 mgd, are assumed to consist of a filter gallery with flocculation tanks (composed of paddles and baffles) and settling (or sedimentation) basins as main components, chemical tanks (needed in the coagulation and other destabilization processes), chlorination tanks, electrical and mechanical equipment, and elevated pipes.

Medium water treatment plants, with capacity ranging from 50 mgd to 200 mgd, are simulated by adding more redundancy to small treatment plants (i.e. twice as many flocculation, sedimentation, chemical and chlorination tanks).

Large water treatment plants, with capacity above 200 mgd, are simulated by adding even more redundancy to small treatment plants (i.e., three times as many flocculation, sedimentation, chemical and chlorination tanks/basins).

Water treatment plants are also classified based on whether the subcomponents (equipment and backup power) are anchored or not as defined in section 3.2.1.

Pumping Plants (PP)

Pumping plants are usually composed of a building, one or more pumps, electrical equipment, and in some cases, backup power systems. Pumping plants are classified as either small PP (less than 10 mgd capacity) or medium/large PP (more than 10 mgd capacity). Pumping plants are also classified with respect to whether the subcomponents (equipment and backup power) are anchored or not. As noted in Chapter 3.2.1, anchored means equipment designed with special seismic tie downs and tiebacks while unanchored means equipment with manufactures normal requirements.

Wells (WE)

Wells typically have a capacity between 1 and 5 mgd. Wells are used in many cities as a primary or supplementary source of water supply. Wells include a shaft from the surface down to the aquifer, a pump to bring the water up to the surface, equipment used to treat the water, and sometimes a building, which encloses the well and equipment.

Water Storage Tanks (ST)

Water storage tanks can be elevated steel, on ground steel (anchored/unanchored), on ground concrete (anchored/unanchored), buried concrete, or on ground wood tanks. Typical capacity of storage tanks is in the range of 0.5 mgd to 2 mgd.

Distribution Facilities and Distribution Pipes

Distribution of water can be accomplished by gravity, or by pumps in conjunction with on-line storage. Except for storage reservoirs located at a much higher altitude than the area being served, distribution of water would necessitate, at least, some pumping along the way. Typically, water is pumped at a relatively constant rate, with flow in excess of consumption being stored in elevated storage tanks. The stored water provides a reserve for fire flow and may be used for general-purpose flow should the electric power fail, or in case of pumping capacity loss. Distribution pipelines are commonly made of concrete (prestressed or reinforced), asbestos cement, ductile iron, cast iron, steel, or plastic. The selection of material type and pipe size are based on the desired carrying capacity, availability of material, durability, and cost. Distribution pipes represent the network that delivers water to consumption areas. Distribution pipes may be further subdivided into primary lines, secondary lines, and small distribution mains. The primary or arterial mains carry flow from the pumping station to and from elevated storage tanks, and to the consumption areas, whether residential, industrial, commercial, or public. These lines are typically laid out in interlocking loops, and all smaller lines connecting to them are typically valved so that failure in smaller lines does not require shutting off the larger. Primary lines can be up to 36 inches in diameter. Secondary lines are smaller loops within the primary mains and run from one primary line to another. They serve primarily to provide a large amount of water for fire fighting without excessive pressure loss. Small distribution lines represent the mains that supply water to the user and to the fire hydrants. In this earthquake loss estimation study, the simplified method for water system network performance evaluation applies to a distribution pipe network digitized at the primary level.

4.1.2 Definition of Damage States of Potable Water System Components

Potable water systems are susceptible to earthquake damage. Facilities such as water treatment plants; wells, pumping plants and storage tanks are most vulnerable to PGA, and sometimes PGD, if located in liquefiable or landslide zones. Therefore, the damage states for these components are defined and associated with PGA and PGD. Aqueducts and pipelines, on the other hand, are vulnerable to PGV and PGD. Therefore, the damage states for these components are associated with these two ground motion parameters.

Damage states describing the level of damage to each of the water system components are defined (i.e., slight/minor, moderate, extensive, or complete), while for pipelines, the number of repairs/km is the key parameter.

4.1.2.1. Damage State Definitions for Components Other than Pipelines

A total of five damage states for potable water system components are defined. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4), and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For water treatment plants, DS2 is defined by malfunction of plant for a short time (less than three days) due to loss of electric power and backup power if any, considerable damage to various equipment, light damage to sedimentation basins, light damage to chlorination tanks, or light damage to chemical tanks. Loss of water quality may occur.
- For **pumping plants**, DS2 is defined by malfunction of plant for a short time (less than three days) due to loss of electric power and backup power if any, or slight damage to buildings.
- For wells, DS2 is defined by malfunction of well pump and motor for a short time (less than three days) due to loss of electric power and backup power if any, or light damage to buildings.
- For storage tanks, DS2 is defined by the tank suffering minor damage without loss of its contents or functionality. Minor damage to the tank roof due to water sloshing, minor cracks in concrete tanks, or localized wrinkles in steel tanks fits the description of this damage state.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For water treatment plants, DS3 is defined by malfunction of plant for about a week due to loss of electric power and backup power if any, extensive damage to various equipment, considerable damage to sedimentation basins, considerable damage to chlorination tanks with no loss of contents, or considerable damage to chemical tanks. Loss of water quality is imminent.
- For **pumping plants**, DS3 is defined by the loss of electric power for about a week, considerable damage to mechanical and electrical equipment, or moderate damage to buildings.
- For wells, DS3 is defined by malfunction of well pump and motor for about a week due to loss of electric power and backup power if any, considerable damage to mechanical and electrical equipment, or moderate damage to buildings.
 - For **Storage Tanks**, DS3 is defined by the tank being considerably damaged, but only minor loss of content. Elephant foot buckling for steel tanks without loss of content or moderate cracking of concrete tanks with minor loss of content fits the description of this damage state.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For water treatment plants, DS4 is defined by the pipes connecting the different basins and chemical units being extensively damaged. This type of damage will likely result in the shutdown of the plant.
- For **pumping plants**, DS4 is defined by the building being extensively damaged, or the pumps being badly damaged beyond repair.
- For wells, DS4 is defined by the building being extensively damaged or the well pump and vertical shaft being badly distorted and nonfunctional.
- For **Storage Tanks**, DS4 is defined by the tank being severely damaged and going out of service. Elephant foot buckling for steel tanks with loss of content, stretching of bars for wood tanks, or shearing of wall for concrete tanks fits the description of this damage state.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For water treatment plants, DS5 is defined by the complete failure of all pipings, or extensive damage to the filter gallery.
- For **pumping plants**, DS5 is defined by the building collapsing.
- For wells, DS5 is defined by the building collapsing.
- For Storage Tanks, DS5 is defined by the tank collapsing and losing all of its content.

4.1.2.1. Damage State Definitions for Pipelines

For pipelines, two damage states are considered. These are leaks and breaks. Generally, when a pipe is damaged due to ground failure (PGD), the type of damage is likely to be a break, while when a pipe is damaged due to seismic wave propagation (PGV), the type of damage is likely to be joint pull-out or crushing at the bell.

4.1.3 Functionality of Potable Water System Pipelines

The loss assessment methodology estimates the flow reduction to the areas served by the water system being evaluated. In other words, a functionality of 50% means that 50% of the population would be affected because of potable water disruption.

4.2. Waste Water Systems

This system consists of transmission and treatment components. These components are vulnerable to damage during earthquakes, which may result in significant disruption to the utility network.

4.2.1 Description of Waste Water System Components

A waste water system typically consists of collection sewers, interceptors, lift stations, and wastewater treatment plants. In this section, a brief description of each of these components is given.

Collection Sewers

Collection sewers are generally closed conduits that carry normally sewage with a partial flow. Collection sewers could be sanitary sewers, storm sewers, or combined sewers. Pipe materials that are used for potable water transportation may also be used for wastewater collection. The most commonly used sewer material is clay pipe manufactured with integral bell and spigot end. These pipes range in size from 4 to 42 inches in diameter. Concrete pipes are mostly used for storm drains and for sanitary sewers carrying noncorrosive sewage (i.e. with organic materials). For the smaller diameter range, plastic pipes are also used.

Interceptors

Interceptors are large diameter sewer mains. They are usually located at the lowest elevation areas. Pipe materials that are used for interceptor sewers are similar to those used for collection sewers.

Lift Stations (LS)

Lift stations are important parts of the waste water system. Lift stations serve to raise sewage over topographical rises. If the lift station is out of service for more than a short time, untreated sewage will either spill out near the lift station, or back up into the collection sewer system. In this study, lift stations are classified as either small LS (capacity less than 10 mgd) or medium/large LS (capacity greater than 10 mgd). Lift stations are also classified as having either anchored or unanchored subcomponents (see Section 3.2.1 for the definition of anchored and unanchored subcomponents)

Waste Water Treatment Plants (WWTP)

Three sizes of wastewater treatment plants are considered: small (capacity less than 50 mgd), medium (capacity between 50 and 200 mgd), and large (capacity greater than 200 mgd). WWTP has the same processes existing in WTP with the addition of secondary treatment subcomponents.

4.2.2 Definitions of Damage States of Waste Water System Components

Waste water systems are susceptible to earthquake damage. Facilities such as waste water treatment plants and lift stations are mostly vulnerable to PGA, and sometimes PGD, if located in liquefiable or landslide zones. Therefore, the damage states for these components are defined and associated with PGA and PGD. Sewers, on the other hand, are vulnerable to PGV and PGD. Therefore, the damage algorithms for these components are associated with those two ground motion parameters.

4.2.2.1. Damage States Definitions for Components other than Sewers/Interceptors

A total of five damage states are defined for waste water system components other than sewers and interceptors. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For waste water treatment plants, DS2 is defined as for WTP in potable water systems.
- For lift stations, DS2 is defined as for pumping plants in potable water systems.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For waste water treatment plants, DS3 is defined as for WTP in potable water systems.
- For lift stations, DS3 is defined as for pumping plants in potable water systems.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For waste water treatment plants, DS4 is defined as for WTP in potable water systems.
- For lift stations, DS4 is defined as for pumping plants in potable water systems.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For waste water treatment plants, DS5 is defined as for WTP in potable water systems.
- For lift stations, DS5 is defined as for pumping plants in potable water systems. *4.2.2.2. Damage States Definitions for Sewers/Interceptors*

For sewers/interceptors, two damage states are considered. These are leaks and

breaks. Generally, when a sewer/interceptor is damaged due to ground failure, the type of damage is likely to be a break, while when a sewer/interceptor is damaged due to seismic wave propagation; the type of damage is likely to be joint pullout or crushing at the bell. In the loss methodology, it is assumed that damage due to seismic waves will consist of 80% leaks and 20% breaks, while damage due to ground failure will consist of 20% leaks and 80% breaks. The user can override these default percentages.

4.3. Oil Systems

This system consists of refineries and transmission components. These components are vulnerable to damage during earthquakes, which may result in significant disruption to this utility network.

4.3.1. Description of Oil System Components

An oil system typically consists of refineries, pumping plants, tank farms, and pipelines. In this section, a brief description of each of these components is given.

Refineries (RF)

Refineries are an important part of an oil system. They are used for processing crude oil before it can be used. Although supply of water is critical to the functioning of refinery, it is assumed in the methodology that an uninterrupted supply of water is available to the refinery. Two sizes of refineries are considered: small, and medium/large.

Small refineries (capacity less than 100,000 barrels per day), are assumed to consist of steel tanks on grade, stacks, other electrical and mechanical equipment, and elevated pipes. Stacks are essentially tall cylindrical chimneys.

Medium/Large refineries (capacity more than 100,000 barrels per day), are simulated by adding more redundancy to small refineries (i.e. twice as many tanks, stacks, elevated pipes).

Oil Pipelines

Oil pipelines are used for the transportation of oil over long distances. About seventy-five percent of the crude oil is transported throughout the United States by pipelines. A large segment of industry and millions of people could be severely affected by disruption of crude oil supplies. Rupture of crude oil pipelines could lead to pollution of land and rivers. Pipelines are typically made of mild steel with submerged arc welded joints, although older gas welded steel pipe may be present in some systems. In this study, buried pipelines are considered to be vulnerable to PGV and PGD.

Pumping Plants (PP)

Pumping plants serve to maintain the flow of oil in cross-country pipelines. Pumping plants usually use two or more pumps. Pumps can be of either centrifugal or reciprocating type. However, no differentiation is made between these two types of pumps in the analysis of oil systems. Pumping plants are classified as having either anchored or unanchored subcomponents, as defined in 3.2.1.

Tank Farms (TF)

Tank farms are facilities that store fuel products. They include tanks, pipes and electric components. Tank farms are classified as having either anchored or unanchored subcomponents, as defined in Section 3.2.1.

4.3.2. Definitions of Damage States of Oil System Components

Oil systems are susceptible to earthquake damage. Facilities such as refineries, pumping plants and tank farms are mostly vulnerable to PGA, and sometimes PGD, if located in liquefiable or landslide zones. Therefore, the damage states for these components are defined and associated with PGA and PGD. Pipelines, on the other hand, are vulnerable to PGV and PGD. Therefore, the damage states for these components are associated with these two ground motion parameters.

4.3.2.1 Damage States Definitions for Components other than Pipelines

A total of five damage states are defined for oil system components other than pipelines. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For **refineries**, DS2 is defined by malfunction of plant for a short time (few days) due to loss of electric power and backup power, if any, or light damage to tanks.
- For **pumping plants**, DS2 is defined by light damage to building.
- For **tank farms**, DS2 is defined by malfunction of plant for a short time (less than three days) due to loss of backup power or light damage to tanks.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

• For **refineries**, DS3 is defined by malfunction of plant for a week or so due to loss of electric power and backup power if any, extensive damage to various equipment, or considerable damage to tanks.
- For **pumping plants**, DS3 is defined by considerable damage to mechanical and electrical equipment, or considerable damage to building.
- For **tank farms**, DS3 is defined by malfunction of tank farm for a week or so due to loss of backup power, extensive damage to various equipment, or considerable damage to tanks.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For **refineries**, DS4 is defined by the tanks being extensively damaged, or stacks collapsing.
- For **pumping plants**, DS4 is defined by the building being extensively damaged, or pumps badly damaged.
- For **tank farms**, DS4 is defined by the tanks being extensively damaged, or extensive damage to elevated pipes.

Complete Damage (DS5)

- For **refineries**, DS5 is defined by the complete failure of all elevated pipes, or collapse of tanks.
- For **pumping plants**, DS5 is defined by the building being in complete damage state.
- For **tank farms**, DS5 is defined by the complete failure of all elevated pipes, or collapse of tanks.

4.3.2.2. Damage State Definitions for Pipelines

For pipelines, two damage states are considered. These are leaks and breaks. Generally, when a pipe is damaged due to ground failure, the type of damage is likely to be a break, while when a pipe is damaged due to seismic wave propagation; the type of damage is likely to be local buckling of the pipe wall.

4.4. Natural Gas Systems

4.4.1. Description of Natural Gas System Components

A natural gas system typically consists of compressor stations and pipelines. In this section, a brief description of each of these components is given.

Compressor Stations

Compressor stations serve to maintain the flow of gas in cross-country pipelines. Compressor stations consist of either centrifugal or reciprocating compressors. However, no differentiation is made between these two types of compressors in the analysis of natural gas systems. Compressor stations are categorized as having either anchored or unanchored subcomponents, as defined in Section 3.2.1. The compressor stations are similar to pumping plants in oil systems discussed in Section 4.3.1.

Natural Gas Pipelines

Pipelines are typically made of mild steel with submerged arc welded joints, although older lines may have gas-welded joints. These are used for the transportation of natural gas over long distances. Many industries and residents could be severely affected should disruption of natural gas supplies occur.

4.4.2 Definitions of Damage States of Natural Gas System Components

Facilities such as compressor stations are mostly vulnerable to PGA, sometimes PGD, if located in liquefiable or landslide zones. Therefore, damage states for these components are defined and associated with either PGA or PGD. Pipelines, on the other hand, are vulnerable to PGV and PGD; therefore, damage states for these components are associated with these two ground motion parameters.

4.4.2.1 Damage States Definitions for Compressor Stations

A total of five damage states are defined for gas system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

DS2 is defined by slight damage to building.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

DS3 is defined by considerable damage to mechanical and electrical equipment, or considerable damage to building.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

DS4 is defined by the building being extensively damaged or the pumps badly damaged beyond repair.

Complete Damage (DS5)

DS5 is defined by the building in complete damage state.

4.4.2.2 Damage States Definitions for Pipelines

For pipelines, two damage states are considered. These are leaks and breaks. Generally, when a pipe is damaged due to ground failure, the type of damage is likely to be a break, while when a pipe is damaged due to seismic wave propagation; the type of damage is likely to be local bucking of the pipe wall. In the loss methodology, it is assumed that damage due to seismic waves will consist of 80% leaks and 20% breaks, while damage due to ground failure will consist of 20% leaks and 80% breaks. The user can override these default percentages.

4.5. Electric Power Systems

4.5.1. Description of Electric Power System Components

As mentioned before, the components of an electric power system considered in the loss estimation methodology are substations, distribution circuits, and generation plants. In this section a brief description of each of these components is presented.

Substations

An electric substation is a facility that serves as a source of energy supply for the local distribution area in which it is located, and has the following main functions:

- Change or switch voltage from one level to another.

- Provide points where safety devices such as disconnect switches, circuit breakers, and other equipment can be installed.

- Regulate voltage to compensate for system voltage changes.

- Eliminate lightning and switching surges from the system.
- Convert AC to DC and DC to AC, as needed.
- Change frequency, as needed.

Substations can be entirely enclosed in buildings where all the equipment is assembled into one metal clad unit. Other substations have step-down transformers, high voltage switches, oil circuit breakers, and lightning arrestors located outside the substation building. In the current loss estimation methodology, only transmission (138 kV to 765 kV or higher) and subtransmission (34.5 kV to 161 kV) substations are considered. These will be classified as high voltage (350 kV and above), medium voltage (150 kV to 350 kV) and low voltage (34.5 kV to 150 kV), and will be referred to as 500 kV substations, 230kV substations, and 115kV substations, respectively. The classification is also a function of whether the subcomponents are anchored or typical (unanchored), as defined in Section 3.2.1.

Distribution Circuits

The distribution system is divided into a number of circuits. A distribution circuit includes poles, wires, in-line equipment and utility-owned equipment at customer sites. A distribution circuit also includes above ground and underground conductors. Distribution circuits either consist of anchored or unanchored components.

Generation Plants

These plants produce alternating current (AC) and may be any of the following types:

- Hydroelectric
- Steam turbine (fossil fuel fired or nuclear)
- Combustion turbine (fossil fuel fired)
- Geothermal
- Solar
- Wind
- Compressed air

Fossil fuels are either: coal, oil, or natural gas. Generation plant subcomponents include diesel generators, turbines, racks and panels, boilers and pressure vessels, and the building in which these are housed. The size of the generation plant is determined from the number of Megawatts of electric power that the plant can produce under normal operations. Small generation plants have a generation capacity of less than 200 Megawatts. Medium/Large generation plants have a capacity greater than 200 Megawatts. Fragility curves for generation plants with anchored versus unanchored subcomponents are presented.

4.5.2. Definitions of Damage States of Electric Power Systems

Electric power systems are susceptible to earthquake damage. Facilities such as substations, generation plants, and distribution circuits are mostly vulnerable to PGA, and sometimes PGD, if located in liquefiable or landslide zones. Therefore, the damage states for these components are defined in terms of PGA and PGD. A total of five damage states are defined for electric power system components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Note that for power systems, in particular for substations and distribution circuits, these damage states are defined with respect to the percentage of subcomponents being damaged. That is, for a substation with n1 transformers, n2 disconnect switches, n3 circuit breakers, and n4 current transformers, the substation is said to be in a slight or minor damage state if 5% of n2 or 5% of n3 are damaged, and it is in the extensive damage state if 70% of n1, 70% of n2, or 70% of n3 are damaged, or if the building is in extensive damage state. A parametric study on n1, n2, n3, and n4 values shows that the medians of the damage states defined in this manner don't change appreciably (less than 3%) as the ni's vary, while the corresponding dispersions get smaller as the ni's increase.

Therefore, we used dispersions obtained from the small sample numbers along with the relatively constant median values.

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

- For **substations**, DS2 is defined as the failure of 5% of the disconnect switches (i.e., misalignment), or the failure of 5% of the circuit breakers (i.e., circuit breaker phase sliding off its pad, circuit breaker tipping over, or interrupter-head falling to the ground), or by the building being in minor damage state.
- For **distribution circuits**, DS2 is defined by the failure of 4 % of all circuits.
- For generation plants, DS2 is defined by turbine tripping, or light damage to diesel generator, or by the building being in minor damage state.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

- For **substations**, DS3 is defined as the failure of 40% of disconnect switches (e.g., misalignment), or 40% of circuit breakers (e.g., circuit breaker phase sliding off its pad, circuit breaker tipping over, or interrupter-head falling to the ground), or failure of 40% of current transformers (e.g., oil leaking from transformers, porcelain cracked), or by the building being in moderate damage state.
- For **distribution circuits**, DS3 is defined by the failure of 12% of circuits.
- For generation plants, DS3 is defined some by the chattering of instrument panels and racks, considerable damage to boilers and pressure vessels, or by the building being in moderate damage state.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

- For **substations**, DS4 is defined as the failure of 70% of disconnect switches (e.g., misalignment), 70% of circuit breakers, 70% of current transformers (e.g., oil leaking from transformers, porcelain cracked), or by failure of 70% of transformers (e.g., leakage of transformer radiators), or by the building being in extensive damage state.
- For **distribution circuits**, DS4 is defined by the failure of 50% of all circuits.
- For generation plants, DS4 is defined by considerable damage to motor driven pumps, or considerable damage to large vertical pumps, or by the building being in extensive damage state.

Complete Damage (DS5)

• For **substations**, DS5 is defined as the failure of all disconnect switches, all circuit breakers, all transformers, or all current transformers, or by the building being in complete damage state.

- For distribution circuits, DS5 is defined by the failure of 80% of all circuits.
- For generation plants, DS5 is defined by extensive damage to large horizontal vessels beyond repair, extensive damage to large motor operated valves, or by the building being in complete damage state.

4.6. Communication Systems

The major components of a communication system are:

- Central offices and broadcasting stations (this includes all subcomponents such as central switching equipment)
- Transmission lines (these include all subcomponents such as equipment used to connect central office to end users)
- Cabling (low capacity links)

Central offices and broadcasting stations are the only components of the communication system considered in this section.

4.6.1. Description of Communication System Components

As it was mentioned previously, only facilities are considered. A communication facility consists of a building (generic type is assumed in the methodology), central switching equipment (i.e., digital switches, anchored or unanchored), and back-up power supply (i.e. diesel generators or battery generators, anchored or unanchored) that may be needed to supply the requisite power to the center in case of loss of off-site power.

4.6.2. Definitions of Damage States

Communication facilities are susceptible to earthquake damage. A total of five damage states are defined for these components. These are none (DS1), slight/minor (DS2), moderate (DS3), extensive (DS4) and complete (DS5).

Slight/Minor Damage (DS2)

Slight damage, DS2 is defined by slight damage to the communication facility building, or inability of the center to provide services during a short period (few days) due to loss of electric power and backup power, if available.

Moderate Damage (DS3)

Moderate damage, DS3 is defined by moderate damage to the communication facility building, few digital switching boards being dislodged, or the central office being out of service for a few days due to loss of electric power (i.e., power failure) and backup power (typically due to overload), if available.

Extensive Damage (DS4)

Extensive damage, DS4 is defined by severe damage to the communication facility building resulting in limited access to facility, or by many digital switching boards being dislodged, resulting in malfunction.

Complete Damage (DS5)

Complete damage, DS5 is defined by complete damage to the communication facility building, or damage beyond repair to digital switching boards.

Part II

5. Casualties

In the loss assessment methodology there are four categories for casualties, from Level I to IV, depending on the injury classification scale.

5.1. Injury Severity Level I

Injuries requiring basic medical aid that could be administered by paraprofessionals; these types of injuries would require bandages or observation. Some examples are: a sprain, a severe cut requiring stitches, a minor burn (first degree or second degree on a small part of the body), or a bump on the head without loss of consciousness. Injuries of lesser severity that could be self treated are not estimated by HAZUS-MH MR2.

5.2. Injury Severity Level II

Injuries requiring a greater degree of medical care and use of medical technology, such as x-rays or surgery, but not expected to progress to a life threatening status. Some examples are third degree burns or second degree burns over large parts of the body, a bump on the head that causes loss of consciousness, fractured bone, dehydration or exposure.

5.3. Injury Severity Level III

Injuries that pose an immediate life threatening condition if not treated adequately and expeditiously. Some examples are: uncontrolled bleeding, punctured organ, other internal injuries, spinal column injuries, or crush syndrome.

5.4. Injury Severity Level IV

Instantaneously killed or mortally injured

Conclusion

This terminology guide contains definitions for the loss assessment analysis reports made by the Mid-America Earthquake Center for the FEMA Catastrophic Event Planning project. The main objective of this document is to help planners to understand engineering terms contained in the reports. In order to improve this document, comments and suggestions from users are very important to be considered in future versions.

Appendix VIII: Damage and Loss Maps

This appendix includes maps of direct damage and functionality loss to infrastructure as well as demographic data, induced damage, and social impacts. These maps are designed to support the scenario report provided to each state in the New Madrid Seismic Zone. A total of ten scenarios are represented in this appendix and are listed below:

- 1. New Madrid Seismic Zone M_w7.7 Event for the State of Alabama
- 2. East Tennessee Seismic Zone M_w5.9 Event for the State of Alabama
- 3. New Madrid Seismic Zone M_w7.7 Event for the State of Arkansas
- 4. New Madrid Seismic Zone M_w7.7 Event for the State of Illinois
- 5. New Madrid Seismic Zone M_w7.7 Event for the State of Indiana
- 6. Wabash Valley Seismic Zone M_w7.1 Event for the State of Indiana
- 7. New Madrid Seismic Zone M_w 7.7 Event for the State of Kentucky
- 8. New Madrid Seismic Zone $M_w7.7$ Event for the State of Mississippi
- 9. New Madrid Seismic Zone M_w7.7 Event for the State of Missouri
- 10. New Madrid Seismic Zone M_w7.7 Event for the State of Tennessee

For more information on the scenarios employed, including hazard, inventory, and fragility components, please refer to the appropriate appendices. Additionally, a discussion of detailed results for each scenario represented in this appendix can be found in Appendix V.

Each scenario represented here has more than 30 maps showing impacts to various types of infrastructure and population groups. Though not all scenarios will have every map listed below, each scenario will contain a majority of the following types of damage and loss maps:

- Airport Damage
- Airport Functionality at Day 1
- Worst-Case Casualties¹
- Communication Facility Damage
- Dam Inventory with Modified Mercalli Intensity
- Total Debris Generated
- Displaced Population
- Electric Power Facility Damage
- Emergency Operation Center (EOC) Damage
- Emergency Operation Center Functionality at Day 1
- Ferry Facility Damage
- Fire Station Damage
- Fire Station Functionality at Day 1
- Hazardous Materials Facility Inventory with Modified Mercalli Intensity
- Highway Bridge Functionality at Day 1
- Highway Bridge & Segment Damage

¹ This indicates the time of day where the greatest number of casualties occur

- Hospital Damage
- Hospital Functionality at Day 1
- Liquefaction Susceptibility
- Modified Mercalli Intensity
- Natural Gas Facility Damage with Major Transmission Pipelines
- Oil Facility Damage with Major Transmission Pipelines
- Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA)
- Police Station Damage
- Police Station Functionality at Day 1
- Total Population
- Port Facility Damage
- Potable Water Facility & Local Distribution Network Damage
- Prison Inventory with Modified Mercalli Intensity
- Railway Bridge & Segment Damage
- Railway Bridge Functionality at Day 1
- School Damage
- School Functionality at Day 1
- Waste Water Facility & Local Distribution Network Damage

All infrastructure damage maps represent the likelihood of damage for facilities in the at least moderate damage state. The definition of this damage state varies with the type of facility, and descriptions of these damage states can be found in Appendix VII. For additional information on these damage states, please refer to the HAZUS-MH MR2 Technical Manual. All infrastructure functionalities are displayed for the day after the earthquake, termed Day 1. Estimates of infrastructure functionality are available for various intervals after the event including Days 3, 7, 14, 30, and 90, though they are not illustrated in this report. The greatest number of facilities will be non-operational immediately after the earthquake, thus Day 1 functionality represents the greatest number of non-functioning facilities and the greatest reduction in services to affected populations. Finally, all maps include a table quantifying impacts to a set of critical counties in the state shown. These counties are closest to the source of seismic activity and are likely to experience the most significant impacts.



Airport Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Worst Case Casualties - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Communication Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Displaced Population - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Electric Power Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Emergency Operation Center Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



EOC Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Ferry Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Fire Station Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Fire Station Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hazardous Materials Facilities - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Highway Bridge Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Highway Bridge & Segment Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hospital Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hospital Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Modified Mercalli Intensity - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Natural Gas Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Oil Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Peak Ground Acceleration - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Port Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event


Potable Water Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Railway Bridge Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Railway Bridge & Segment Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



School Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



School Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Total Debris - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Total Population (2000) - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Waste Water Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Airport Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Airport Functionality - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Worst Case Casualties - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Communication Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event





Displaced Population - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Electric Power Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Emergency Operation Center Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event Mar



EOC Functionality - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Ferry Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Fire Station Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Fire Station Functionality - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Hazardous Materials Facilities - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Highway Bridge Functionality -East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Highway Bridge & Segment Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Hospital Damage -East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Hospital Functionality - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Liquefaction Susceptibility - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Modified Mercalli Intensity - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Natural Gas Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Oil Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Peak Ground Acceleration - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Police Station Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Police Station Functionality - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Port Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Potable Water Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event






Railway Bridge Functionality - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Railway Bridge & Segment Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



School Damage - School Damage Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



School Functionality - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Total Debris - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Total Population (2000) - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event



Waste Water Facility Damage - East Tennessee Seismic Zone: M5.9 Event







Airport Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event









Displaced Population - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008















Hazardous Materials Facilities - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008









Hospital Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

Liquefaction Susceptibility - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008





Modified Mercalli Intensity - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008







Peak Ground Acceleration - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008









Potable Water Facilities Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Railway Bridge Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event






April 2008





Total Population (Year 2000) - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

April 2008



April 2008







Febraruy 2008



Worst Case Casualties (2 AM) - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Communication Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







Displaced Population - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Electric Power Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Emergency Operation Center Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Emergency Oper. Center Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Ferry Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







Fire Station Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hazardous Materials Facilities - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Highway Bridge Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Highway Bridge & Segment Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hospital Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hospital Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Liquefaction Susceptibility - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Modified Mercalli Intensity - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Natural Gas Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Oil Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Peak Ground Acceleration - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Port Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Potable Water Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Railway Bridge Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Railway Bridge & Segment Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event




February 2008



School Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

February 2008



Waste Water Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

February 2008



Airport Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Airport Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Worst Case Casualties (5PM) - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Communication Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Displaced Population - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Electric Power Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Emergency Operation Center Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



EOC Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event

March 2008

Total

No. of



There sa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Fire Station Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Fire Station Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hazardous Materials Facilities - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Highway Bridge Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Highway Bridge & Segment Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hospital Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hospital Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Liquefaction Susceptibility - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Modified Mercalli Intensity - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Natural Gas Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Oil Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Peak Ground Acceleration - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Port Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Potable Water Facilities Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







Railway Bridge Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Railway Bridge & Segment Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



School Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



School Functionality at Day 1 - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Total Debris - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Total Population (2000) - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Waste Water Facilities Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event


Airport Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Airport Functionality at Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Worst Case Casualties (2AM)- Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Communication Facility Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event





Displaced Population - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Electric Power Facility Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Emergency Oper. Center Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



EOC Functionality at Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Fire Station Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Fire Station Functionality at Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Hazardous Materials Facilities - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Highway Bridge Functionality:Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Highway Bridge & Segment Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Hospital Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Hospital Functionality at Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Liquefaction Susceptibility - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Modified Mercalli Intensity - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Natural Gas Facility Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Oil Facility Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Peak Ground Acceleration - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Police Station Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Police Station Functionality at Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Port Facility Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Potable Water Facilities Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event





Railway Bridge Functionality: Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Railway Bridge & Segment Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



School Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



School Functionality at Day 1 - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Total Debris - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Total Population (2000) - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event



Waste Water Facilities Damage - Wabash Valley Seismic Zone: M7.1 Event






































































Airport Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Worst Case Casualties (2PM) - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Communication Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event








Displaced Population - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Electric Power Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Emergency Operation Center Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Ferry Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







Fire Station Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Hazardous Materials Facilities - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Highway Bridge Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event









Hospital Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Liquefaction Susceptibility - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Modified Mercalli Intensity - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Natural Gas Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Oil Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Peak Ground Acceleration - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Police Station Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Total Population (2000) - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Port Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Potable Water Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event





Railway Bridge Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event







School Functionality - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event



Waste Water Facility Damage - New Madrid Seismic Zone: M7.7 Event












































































Am r S. Elhasha I. Project Principal Investigator There sa Jefferson, Principal Investigator





University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA Amir S. Einashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator





Mid-America Earthquake Center

University of Illihois at Urbana–Champaigh, Illihois, USA Amir S. Einashai, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator





n r S. Einasha I, Project Principal investigat Theresa Jefferson, Principal investigator








There sa Je ffe is on, Principal Investigator 889



n kerstky of illinois at Urbana–Champaign, illinois, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator



University of liliho is at Urbana–Champaign, liliho is, USA Amir S. Einashai, ProjectPrincipal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

University of Illiho is at Urbana–Champaign, Illiho 5, USA Amir S. Elhaskal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Am r S. Elhashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

There sa Jeffe ison, Principal Investigator

There sa Jeffe ison, Principal Investigator

There sa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

There sa Jeffe ison, Principal Investigator

Theresa Jeffelson, Principal Investigator

ershy of lillho is at Urbana–Cham pa bin, lillho is, US Amir S. Elhasha I, Project Pincipal hvestiga for Theresa Jefferson, Principal investigator

n r S. Einasha I, ProjectPrincipal investigat Theresa Jefferson, Principal investigator

There sa Jeffe ison, Principal investigator

nkerstky of illino is at Urbana–Champa byn, illino is, USA Amir S. Eina sha i ProjectPrincipal investigator There sa Jefferson, Principal investigation

Nersity of Illino is at Urbana-Champaign, Illino b, USA Amir S. Einashal, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

h kershtor fillino is at Urbana–Champa bin, lilino is, USA Amir S. Elna sha i, Project Principal investigator There sa Jefferson, Principal investigator

i Mershty of Illino Is at Urbana–Champa bin, Illino Is, USA Amir S. Einasha I, Project Principal Investigator Theresa Jefferson, Principal Investigator

Appendix IX: Comparison with CUSEC Earthquake Impact Assessment

The purpose of this appendix is to provide comparative data points for the main analysis, and to verify that consistent results are being obtained in the Central US regions when undertaken by different groups. Moreover, the CUSEC analyses were used in the SONS07 workshops. Providing comparisons between CUSEC and the MAE Center-George Washington University study is necessary for the calibration of response measures intended to be employed by agencies involved in both SONS07 and the current FEMA-lead effort. All scenarios in this appendix employ the New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ) southwest segment event. Liquefaction susceptibility data was included in this analysis, though all other impact assessment parameters remained at the default setting within the program. No scenarios were completed for the Wabash Valley Seismic Zone or the East Tennessee Seismic Zone earthquakes. As a result, no comparisons are made with the scenarios completed by the MAE Center in the investigation presented in the main body of the report. All scenarios discussed in this appendix refer to the NMSZ southwest segment event and results are shown for the critical counties only since the CUSEC analyses only include the areas identified as critical counties in this study.

Alabama

Table 1: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Alabama						
	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
MAEC	227,442	13,052	2,856	63	0	243,419
CUSEC	223,226	14,228	5,502	437	26	243,419

	Total	Day	/ 1	Day	/ 3	Day	7 ו	Day	30	Day	90
	# of Beds	# of Beds	%								
MAEC	2,624	2,134	81.3	2,142	81.6	2,492	95.0	2,620	99.8	2,621	99.9
CUSEC	2,254	1,821	80.8	1,826	81.0	2,080	92.3	2,238	99.3	2,243	99.5

Table 2: Hospital Functionality for the State of Alabama

Table 3: Households without Potable Water for the State of A	labama
--	--------

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	248,471	0	0	0	0	0
CUSEC	248,471	0	0	0	0	0

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	7	0	0
CUSEC	7	0	0

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	20,629	152	37
CUSEC	33,222	112	28

Table 5: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Alabama

Table 6: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Alabama

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	248,471	0	0	0	0	0
CUSEC	248,471	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7: Damage to Waste Water Facilities for the State of Alabama

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	63	3	0
CUSEC	42	1	0

Table 8: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Alabama

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	12,378	121	30
CUSEC	19,933	88	22

Table 9: Damage to Highway Bridges

	# of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	2,366	18	1
CUSEC	1,935	13	0

Table 10: Debris Summary Report for the State of Alabama

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)
MAEC	32.7	12.2	45.0
CUSEC	53.0	26.0	78.0

Table 11: Shelter Requirements for the State of Alabama

	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter
MAEC	27	5
CUSEC	89	25

Table 12: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Alabama

	Level I (Minor Injury)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury- Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (5PM)	29	1	0	0	30
CUSEC (2AM)	64	7	0	1	72

System	MAEC	CUSEC						
Buildings	\$264,939,000	\$129,322,000						
Transportation	\$19,734,000	\$9,340,000						
Utility	\$175,662,000	\$28,514,000						
Total	\$460,335,000	\$167,176,000						

Table 13: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Alabama

Arkansas

Table 14: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Arkansas									
	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total			
MAEC	368,648	83,427	41,327	18,332	50,159	561,893			
CUSEC	359,205	84,171	49,306	16,428	52,796	561,906			

Table 15: Hospital Functionality for the State of Arkansas

	Total	Day	y 1	Day 3		Day 7		Day 30		Day 90	
	# of Beds	# of Beds	%								
MAEC	7,222	3,101	42.9	3,130	43.3	4,395	60.9	5,719	79.2	5,978	82.8
CUSEC	6,979	3,246	46.5	3,268	46.8	4,175	59.8	5,515	79.0	5,850	83.8

Table 16: Households without Potable Water for the State of Arkansas

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	519,225	175,565	174,382	171,216	132,671	79,736
CUSEC	519,225	176,151	175,059	172,140	134,692	92,600

Table 17: Damage to Potable Water Facilities for the State of Arkansas

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	31	7	1
CUSEC	31	6	1

Table 18: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Arkansas

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	85,192	19,309	29,673
CUSEC	85,195	19,983	32,239

Table 19: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Arkansas

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	519,225	95,309	68,562	39,397	13,540	113
CUSEC	519,225	96,438	70,923	42,544	15,291	112

Table 20: D	Damage to	Waste	Water	Facilities	for	the	State	of	Arkansa	IS
-------------	-----------	-------	-------	------------	-----	-----	-------	----	---------	----

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	229	90	23
CUSEC	229	90	24

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	51,117	15,267	23,467
CUSEC	51,117	15,805	25,498

Table 21: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Arkansas

Table 22: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Arkansas

	# of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	2,883	775	512
CUSEC	2,879	287	167

Table 23: Debris Summary Report for the State of Arkansas

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)	
MAEC	3,361	3,708	7,069	
CUSEC	3,526	3,624	7,150	

Table 24: Shelter Requirements for the State of Arkansas

	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter
MAEC	126,987	37,244
CUSEC	47,694	13,865

Table 25: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Arkansas

Level I (Minor Injury)		Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (2AM)	8,883	2,648	409	742	12,682
CUSEC (2AM)	10,847	2,963	330	612	14,751

Table 26: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Arkansas

System	MAEC	CUSEC
Buildings	\$12,533,364,000	\$11,681,053,000
Transportation	\$1,946,586,000	\$1,977,353,000
Utility	\$3,794,526,000	\$4,142,127,000
Total	\$18,274,476,000	\$17,800,533,000

Illinois

Table 27: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Illinois							
	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	n Green Yellow t) (Moderate) (Extensive)		Red (Complete)	Total	
MAEC	352,043	48,140	20,321	5,711	16,857	443,072	
CUSEC	402,264	24,818	10,204	1,521	4,267	443,074	

	Total	Day	y 1	Day	/ 3	Day	7	Day	30	Day	90
# of Beds	# of Beds	# of Beds	%								
MAEC	6,814	4,202	61.7	4,224	62.0	5,186	76.1	6,113	89.7	6,312	92.6
CUSEC	5,796	4,782	82.5	4,793	82.7	5,212	89.9	5,577	96.2	5,639	97.3

Table 28: Hospital Functionality for the State of Illinois

Table 29: Households without Potable Water for the State of Illinois

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	524,859	69,661	48,146	24,347	6,672	76
CUSEC	524,859	20,357	17,003	10,781	0	0

Table 30: Damage to Potable Water Facilities for the State of Illinois

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	74	18	3
CUSEC	74	3	0

Table 31: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Illinois

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	79,646	4,857	5,243
CUSEC	79,646	610	1,491

Table 32: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Illinois

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	524,859	69,641	48,139	24,340	6,678	83
CUSEC	524,859	0	0	0	0	0

Table 33: Damage to Waste Water Facilities for the State of Illinois

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	2,221	642	78
CUSEC	300	18	1

Table 34: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Illinois

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	47,788	3,842	4,147
CUSEC	47,788	483	1,179

Table 35: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Illinois

	# of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	6,554	432	242
CUSEC	6,554	106	57

Table 36: Debris Summary Report for the State of Illinois

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)
MAEC	1,214	1,143	2,358
CUSEC	385	285	669

Table 37: Shelter Requirements for the State of Illinois					
	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter			
MAEC	51,381	14,706			
CUSEC	5,042	1,376			

Table 38: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Illinois

Level I (Minor Injury)		Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (2AM)	4,478	1,236	146	276	6,136
CUSEC (2AM)	1,074	277	30	56	1,438

Table 39: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Illinois

System	MAEC	CUSEC	
Buildings	\$4,868,224,000	\$1,246,257,000	
Transportation	\$841,922,000	\$267,402,000	
Utility	\$25,372,048,000	\$678,455,000	
Total	\$31,082,194,000	\$2,192,114,000	

Indiana

Table 40: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Indiana

	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
MAEC	141,978	14,010	3,281	135	1	159,414
CUSEC	147,672	8,063	2,901	377	401	159,414

Table 41: Hospital Functionality for the State of Indiana

	Total	Day	y 1	Day	y 3	Day	7	Day	30	Day	90
# Be	# of Beds	# of Beds	%								
MAEC	2,101	1,347	64.1	1,354	64.4	1,690	80.4	1,995	95.0	2,009	95.6
CUSEC	2,012	1,720	85.5	1,724	85.7	1,867	92.8	1,984	98.6	1,998	99.3

Table 42: Households without Potable Water for the State of Indiana

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	188,251	44,112	34,801	11,073	0	0
CUSEC	188,251	2	0	0	0	0

Table 43: Damage to Potable Water Facilities for the State of Indiana

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	16	1	0
CUSEC	16	0	0

Table 44. Damage to Fotable Water Expenses for the State of Indiana								
	Length (miles) Total Number of Leaks Total Number of Break							
MAEC	22,653	221	597					
CUSEC	22,654	74	49					

Table 44: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Indiana

Table 45: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Indiana

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	188,251	0	0	0	0	0
CUSEC	188,251	0	0	0	0	0

Table 46: Damage to Waste Water Facilities for the State of Indiana

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	52	3	0
CUSEC	52	0	0

Table 47: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Indiana

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	13,594	172	469
CUSEC	13,592	59	39

Table 48: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Indiana

	# of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	2,214	76	14
CUSEC	2,214	2	0

Table 49: Debris Summary Report for the State of Indiana

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)
MAEC	107.3	64.7	172.0
CUSEC	98.0	59.0	158.0

Table 50: Shelter Requirements for the State of Indiana

	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter
MAEC	52	13
CUSEC	549	141

Table 51: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Indiana

	Level I (Minor Injury)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (5PM)	57	12	12	2	84
CUSEC (2AM)	143	31	3	6	183

Table 52: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Indiana

System	MAEC	CUSEC
Buildings	\$348,068,000	\$230,130,000
Transportation	\$69,853,000	\$20,278,000
Utility	\$430,017,000	\$34,521,000
Total	\$847,938,000	\$284,929,000

Kentucky

Table 55. Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Kentucky							
	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Total	
	(None)	(Slight)	(Moderate)	(Extensive)	(Complete)	Total	
MAEC	135,946	27,878	32,403	17,297	28,891	242,337	
CUSEC	179,147	25,914	14,468	5,203	17,618	242,350	

Table 53: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Kentucky

Table 54: Hospital Functionalit	y for the State of Kentucky
---------------------------------	-----------------------------

	Total	Day	y 1	Day	y 3	Day	y 7	Day	30	Day	90
	# of	# of	%								
	Beds	Beds	70								
MAEC	3,312	1,314	39.7	1,323	39.9	1,685	50.9	2,131	64.3	2,271	68.6
CUSEC	3,112	2,155	69.2	2,162	69.5	2,408	77.4	2,708	87.0	2,792	89.7

Table 55: Households without Potable Water for the State of Kentucky

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	256,132	80,808	65,328	39,301	14,371	0
CUSEC	253,853	75,168	71,778	64,250	14,039	0

Table 56: Damage to Potable Water Facilities for the State of Kentucky

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	36	14	2
CUSEC	36	4	0

Table 57: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Kentucky

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	35,884	7,351	7,116
CUSEC	35,884	1,757	4,728

Table 58: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Kentucky

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	256,132	51,079	37,329	20,113	5,613	58
CUSEC	253,853	7,333	4,590	2,174	700	9

Table 59: Damage to Waste Water Facilities for the State of Kentucky

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	1,561	661	170
CUSEC	93	17	2

Table 60: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Kentucky

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	21,532	5,813	5,631
CUSEC	21,530	1,390	3,740

Table 61: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Kentucky						
	# of Bridges At Least Moderate Damage Complete Damage					
MAEC	2,173	368	203			
CUSEC	2,082	132	82			

Table 61: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Kentucky

Table 62: Debris Summary Report for the State of Kentucky

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)
MAEC	2,136	2,337	4,473
CUSEC	1,100	1,144	2,244

Table 63: Shelter Requirements for the State of Kentucky

	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter
MAEC	52,964	13,904
CUSEC	18,168	4,925

Table 64: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Kentucky

	Level I (Minor Injury)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (2PM)	6,722	2,051	318	593	12,584
CUSEC (2AM)	3,463	932	96	176	4,667

Table 65: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Kentucky

System	MAEC	CUSEC
Buildings	\$9,221,413,000	\$4,218,542,000
Transportation	\$990,682,000	\$880,577,000
Utility	\$23,302,503,000	\$716,440,000
Total	\$33,524,598,000	\$5,815,559,000

Mississippi

Table 66: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Mississippi

	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
MAEC	167,551	61,934	23,844	11,399	7,300	272,027
CUSEC	166,536	52,522	28,283	8,342	16,362	272,045

Table 67: Hospital Functionality for the State of Mississippi

	Total		Total Day 1		Day 3 Day		7 Day 30		Day 90		
	# of Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%
MAEC	2,659	779	29.3	790	29.7	1,272	47.8	1,959	73.7	2,174	81.8
CUSEC	3,312	1,314	39.7	1,326	40.0	1,778	53.7	2,547	76.9	2,798	84.5

Table 08: Households without Fotable water for the State of Mississippi									
	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90			
MAEC	275,342	41,790	40,256	39,752	28,749	0			
CUSEC	275,342	62,670	61,956	59,729	35,492	0			

Table 68: Households without Potable Water for the State of Mississippi

Table 69: Damage to Potable Water Facilities for the State of Mississippi

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	3	1	0
CUSEC	3	0	0

Table 70: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Mississippi

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	31,053	2,448	2,566
CUSEC	50.006	2.223	4.093

Table 71: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Mississippi

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	275,342	32,601	18,416	6,452	1,276	44
CUSEC	275,342	8,685	4,944	2,011	607	12

Table 72: Damage to Waste Water Facilities for the State of Mississippi

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	630	176	8
CUSEC	116	20	1

Table 73: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Mississippi

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	30,007	1,935	2,030
CUSEC	30,004	1,758	3,237

Table 74: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Mississippi

	# of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	5,043	300	100
CUSEC	4,032	233	122

Table 75: Debris Summary Report for the State of Mississippi

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)
MAEC	905	1,288	2,193
CUSEC	1,166	1,259	2,425

Table 76: Shelter Requirements for the State of Mississippi

	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter
MAEC	20,832	5,555
CUSEC	15,086	3,926

	Level I (Minor Injury)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (2PM)	2,036	474	45	86	2,646
CUSEC (2AM)	3,484	878	81	145	4,588

Table 77: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Mississippi

Table 78: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Mississippi

System	MAEC	CUSEC
Buildings	\$3,591,980,000	\$4,213,844,000
Transportation	\$224,612,000	\$321,705,000
Utility	\$4,659,756,000	\$580,516,000
Total	\$8,476,348,000	\$5,116,065,000

Missouri

Table 79: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Missouri

	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Green Yellow (Moderate) (Extensive)		Total	
MAEC	780,084	81,136	32,675	13,456	36,889	944,241	
CUSEC	831,862	59,568	25,692	6,418	20,729	944,269	

Table 80: Hospital Functionality for the State of Missouri

Total		Total Day 1		Day	Day 3 Day		7 Day 30		Day 90		
	# of Beds	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%	# of Beds	%
MAEC	15,023	9,875	65.7	9,926	66.1	11,985	79.8	13,988	93.1	14,164	94.3
CUSEC	12,648	9,826	77.7	9,853	77.9	10,825	85.6	11,767	93.0	11,944	94.4

Table 81: Households without Potable Water for the State of Missouri

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	1,184,976	146,376	115,385	79,849	77,817	38,425
CUSEC	1,184,976	93,066	87,846	78,000	66,313	38,744

Table 82: Damage to Potable Water Facilities for the State of Missouri

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	3,413	843	179
CUSEC	52	13	3

Table 83: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Missouri

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	71,169	13,501	20,020
CUSEC	114,598	9,539	17,003

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	1,184,976	100,141	70,719	39,500	12,957	119
CUSEC	1,184,976	40,254	28,491	16,897	6,326	49

Table 84: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Missouri

Table 85: Damage to Waste Water Facilities for the State of Missouri

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	605	107	21
CUSEC	626	54	11

Table 86: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Missouri

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks	
MAEC	42,698	10,674	15,837	
CUSEC	68,759	7,544	13,448	

Table 87: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Missouri

	# of Bridges	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	7,803	1,306	879
CUSEC	7,803	800	564

Table 88: Debris Summary Report for the State of Missouri

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)	
MAEC	3,171	3,386	6,565	
CUSEC	1,750	1,575	3,325	

Table 89: Shelter Requirements for the State of Missouri

	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter
MAEC	121,927	28,999
CUSEC	25,215	7,292

Table 90: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Missouri

	Level I (Minor Injury)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (2AM)	11,267	3,177	401	760	15,605
CUSEC (2AM)	5,871	1,614	193	364	8,042

Table 91: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Missouri

System	MAEC	CUSEC
Buildings	\$11,690,440,000	\$5,528,119,000
Transportation	\$1,727,420,000	\$1,200,249,000
Utility	\$24,502,340,000	\$2,886,090,000
Total	\$37,920,200,000	\$9,614,458,000
Tennessee

	Green (None)	Green (Slight)	Green (Moderate)	Yellow (Extensive)	Red (Complete)	Total
MAEC	495,284	192,666	131,358	42,367	81,907	943,580
CUSEC	609,392	128,847	67,201	22,572	115,591	943,603

Table 92: Damage by General Occupancy for the State of Tennessee

Table 93: Hospital Functionality for the State of Tennessee

Total		Day	y 1	Day	y 3	Day	y 7	Day	30	Day	90
	# of Beds	# of Beds	%								
MAEC	15,351	7,018	45.7	7,053	45.9	8,311	54.1	11,821	77.0	12,884	83.9
CUSEC	12,002	5,566	46.4	5,592	46.6	6,533	54.4	8,299	69.1	9,093	75.8

Table 94: Households without Potable Water for the State of Tennessee

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	1,041,220	446,873	433,653	408,184	360,565	164,784
CUSEC	1,041,220	533,925	531,864	526,080	424,725	317,321

Table 95: Damage to Potable Water Facilities for the State of Tennessee

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	30	12	3
CUSEC	30	8	2

Table 96: Damage to Potable Water Pipelines for the State of Tennessee

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	49,280	18,539	12,242
CUSEC	79,354	11,419	24,050

Table 97: Electrical Power System Performance for the State of Tennessee

	# of Households	At day 1	At day 3	At day 7	At day 30	At day 90
MAEC	1,041,220	426,576	296,234	146,292	37,714	507
CUSEC	1,041,220	262,730	162,971	76,363	24,269	341

Table 98: Damage to Waste Water Facilities for the State of Tennessee

	# of Facilities	At Least Moderate Damage	Complete Damage
MAEC	742	366	76
CUSEC	188	70	15

Table 99: Damage to Waste Water Pipelines for the State of Tennessee

	Length (miles)	Total Number of Leaks	Total Number of Breaks
MAEC	29,568	14,662	9,683
CUSEC	47,613	9,032	19,021

Table 100: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Tennessee						
	# of Bridges At Least Moderate Damage Complete Damage					
MAEC	3,815	953	567			
CUSEC	2,815	674	444			

Table 100: Damage to Highway Bridges for the State of Tennessee

Table 101: Debris Summary Report for the State of Tennessee

	Brick, Wood & Others (Thousands of Tons)	Concrete & Steel (Thousands of Tons)	Total (Thousands of Tons)
MAEC	8,767	11,846	20,613
CUSEC	7,554	8,282	15,836

Table 102: Shelter Requirements for the State of Tennessee

	No. of Displaced Residences	No. People Needing Short-Term Shelter		
MAEC	262,907	73,293		
CUSEC	129,869	36,454		

Table 103: Worst Case Casualties for the State of Tennessee

	Level I (Minor Injury)	Level II (Moderate Injury - Delayed Attention)	Level III (Severe Injury - Immediate Attention)	Level IV (Fatality)	Total Casualties
MAEC (2PM)	31,913	9,706	1,544	2,904	46,067
CUSEC (2PM)	25,692	7,696	1,182	2,183	36,752

Table 104: Total Direct Economic Losses for the State of Tennessee

System	MAEC	CUSEC
Buildings	\$40,192,166,000	\$30,557,641,000
Transportation	\$1,645,129,000	\$2,181,371,000
Utility	\$14,221,248,000	\$2,941,503,000
Total	\$56,058,543,000	\$35,680,515,000

This report is the outcome of one of the largest and most comprehensive earthquake consequence assessment projects funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The report contains earthquake impact assessments for the 8 central US (CUSEC) states. It reports damage and other consequences to the built environment as well as social and economic impacts. The earthquake scenarios used represent the New Madrid, the Wabash Valley and the East Tennessee seismic zones. The analysis employs new and more reliable hazard and inventory data that has not been used before. The work was undertaken in partnership with the Institute for Crisis, Disaster and Risk Management at the George Washington University, with contributions for the 8 State Geological Surveys, IEM, FEMA, US Geological Survey and the Central US Earthquake Consortium.

Mid-America Earthquake Center Report 08-02 Project funded by Federal Emergency Management Agency Managed by US Army Corps of Engineers ERDC-CERL

R

The Mid-America Earthquake Center is a National Science Foundation Engineering Research Center Funded under cooperative agreement reference EEC 97-01785

> SETROM MAP OF THE ALLUVIALVALUEY OF MISSISSI PHI RIVE BY MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION 1887

Director: Amr S. Elnashai Managing Director Timothy Gress



Mid-America Earthquake Center