

Text in green is to be part of UCSF building database and may be part of UCOP database.

Date: 2019-09-04 UCSF Building Seismic Ratings CP Ammonia Facility

CAAN# 2213 2 Medical Center Way, San Francisco, CA 94133 UCSF Campus Site: Parnassus





Rating summary	Entry	Notes
UC Seismic Performance Level	IV/	Findings based on a drawing review and
(rating)	IV	ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 evaluation ¹
Rating basis	Tier 1	ASCE 41-17
Date of rating	2019	
		Priority A=Retrofit ASAP
category for retrofit	NA	Priority B=Retrofit at next permit application for modification
Ballpark total project cost to retrofit to IV rating	NA	Current rating is IV, no retrofit required.
Is 2018-2019 rating required by	No	Revised Policy Program Guidebook
UCOP?	NO	(dated 8 October 2019) would exempt this building.
Further evaluation	None	
recommended?		

¹ The evaluations at UCSF translate the Tier 1 evaluation to a Seismic Performance Level rating using professional judgment discussed among the Seismic Review Committee. Non-compliant items in the Tier 1 evaluation do not automatically put a building into a particular rating category, but such items are evaluated along with the combination of building features and potential deficiencies, focused on the potential for collapse or serious damage to the gravity supporting structure that may threaten occupant safety.



Building information used in this evaluation

• Structural as-built drawing – *Spill Containment Structural Plans*, Physical Plant Department, last as-built revision dated 27 March 1998. Drawings only contain foundation plans and details. Metal building drawings not available.

Scope for completing this form

Reviewed structural drawings (foundation only). Made a visit to the building and performed an ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 evaluation.

Brief Description of Structure

The CP Ammonia Facility is a one-story 790 sq ft pre-fabricated building. The building is separated into two rooms, which include a main room and an adjacent control room (approximately 100 sq ft). The ammonia tank is underground within the footprint of the main room (approximately 690 sq ft). The main room is generally empty. The control room houses electrical equipment.

<u>Identification of Levels</u>: The building is sited on a relatively flat site with grade on the north side being approximately 3 ft higher than the south. A 6 in. retaining wall occurs on the north side extending above and cast monolithically with the concrete foundation wall.

<u>Foundation System</u>: The foundation comprises reinforced concrete perimeter walls supported on continuous strip footings. The underground tank bears on a bed of compacted gravel supported on a 10 in. reinforced slab-on-grade.

<u>Structural system for Vertical (Gravity) Load</u>: The gabled roof framing comprises sheet metal spanning to steel channel purlins. The purlins are supported on a gabled steel moment frame of wide flange shapes. The wide flange columns are anchored to the concrete foundation walls.

<u>Structural System for Lateral Forces</u>: The lateral load-resisting system comprises steel moment frame bents with bolted end plate connections at the columns and at the roof peak in the short direction. The lateral load-resisting system in the long direction comprises tension only rod bracing in a single bay along each perimeter wall coupled with an EIFS type wall system. The roof diaphragm comprises some type of sheet material with diagonal steel rod bracing.

Brief description of seismic deficiencies and Expected Seismic Performance

Identified seismic deficiencies of the building include the following:

• Axial stress in rod bracing is greater than 0.5Fy assuming grade 36 rod. DCR is approximately 3.0.

This building is one-story and lightweight with adequate load paths. While the calculations indicate that the rod bracing is not adequate, past performance of single-story pre-fabricated buildings in earthquakes has been generally satisfactory, especially buildings without mezzanines or heavy contents that load the lightweight structural systems.





Structural deficiency	Affects rating?	Structural deficiency	Affects rating?
Lateral system stress check (wall shear, column shear or flexure, or brace axial as applicable)	Y	Openings at shear walls (concrete or masonry)	N
Load path	Ν	Liquefaction	Ν
Adjacent buildings	Ν	Slope failure	N
Weak story	Ν	Surface fault rupture	N
Soft story	N	Masonry or concrete wall anchorage at flexible diaphragm	N
Geometry (vertical irregularities)	N	URM wall height-to-thickness ratio	N
Torsion	Ν	URM parapets or cornices	N
Mass – vertical irregularity	N	URM chimney	N
Cripple walls	Ν	Heavy partitions braced by ceilings	N
Wood sills (bolting)	N	Appendages	N
Diaphragm continuity	N		

Summary of review of nonstructural life-safety concerns, including at exit routes

The building is unoccupied and used for storage. There are no nonstructural life safety hazards. Two drums are suspended off the southern wall. The drums are supported on a shelf that is structurally connected to structural wall and frame members.

UCOP non-structural checklist item	Life safety hazard?	UCOP non-structural checklist item	Life safety hazard?
Heavy ceilings, feature or ornamentation above large lecture halls, auditoriums, lobbies or other areas where large numbers of people congregate	None extant	Unrestrained hazardous materials storage	None observed
Heavy masonry or stone veneer above exit ways and public access areas	None extant	Masonry chimneys	None observed
Unbraced masonry parapets, cornices or other ornamentation above exit ways and public access areas	Not applicable	Unrestrained natural gas-fueled equipment such as water heaters, boilers, emergency generators, etc.	None observed

Basis of seismic performance level rating

The building rating of IV can be attributed to the lack of critical deficiencies and the good performance of single-story, lightweight pre-fabricated metal buildings in past earthquakes. The building has an adequate load path transferring roof diaphragm forces to the moment frames and braces and down to the foundation through adequate anchorage.

Recommendations for further evaluation or retrofit

We recommend that the University consider the rating in the context of the minimal quantification provided by a Tier 1 evaluation. If acceptable, no further evaluation or retrofit is necessary.



Peer review comments on rating

The structural members of the UCSF Seismic Review Committee (SRC) reviewed the evaluation on 4 September 2019 and agree that the rating is IV. The SRC agrees that further study is not necessary for this building.

Additional building data	Entry	Notes
Latitude	37.76392°	
Longitude	-122.45582°	
Are there other structures besides this one under the same CAAN#	No	
Number of stories above lowest perimeter grade	1	
Number of stories (basements) below lowest perimeter grade	0	
Building occupiable area (OGSF)	790	From UCOP spreadsheet
Risk Category per 2016 CBC 1604.5	I	
Building structural height, h _n	20 ft	As defined per ASCE 7-16 Section 11.2
Coefficient for period, <i>C</i> t	0.02	ASCE 41-17 equation 4-4 and 7-18
Coefficient for period, 🛛	0.75	ASCE 41-17 equation 4-4 and 7-18
Estimated fundamental period	0.19 sec	ASCE 41-17 equation 4-4 and 7-18
Site data		
975 yr hazard parameters S_s , S_1	1.53, 0.603	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Site class	С	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Site class basis	Assumed	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Site parameters F_a , F_v	1.2, 1.4	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Ground motion parameters S_{cs} , S_{c1}	1.836, 0.844	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
S_a at building period	1.836	Calculated
Site V _{s30}	730 m/s	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
V _{s30} basis	Estimated	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Liquefaction potential	No	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Liquefaction assessment basis	Estimated	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Landslide potential	No	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Landslide assessment basis	Flat Site	Rutherford + Chekene Study, 2006





Active fault-rupture hazard identified at site?	No	UCSF Group 3 Buildings, Geotechnical Characteristic and Geohazards (2019)
Site-specific ground motion study?	No	
Applicable code		
Applicable code or approx. date of original construction	As-Built Foundation Drawings Dated: 1998	
Applicable code for partial retrofit	None	No partial retrofit known
Applicable code for full retrofit	None	No full retrofit known
Model building data		
Model building type North-South	S3	Metal building
Model building type East-West	S3	Metal building
FEMA P-154 score	N/A	Not included here because we performed ASCE 41 Tier 1 evaluation.
Previous ratings		
Most recent rating	None	
Date of most recent rating	-	
2 nd most recent rating	-	
Date of 2 nd most recent rating	-	
3 rd most recent rating	-	
Date of 3 rd most recent rating	-	
Appendices		
ASCE 41 Tier 1 checklist included here?	Yes	Refer to attached checklist file





Appendix A

Building Photos







Photo 1. West Elevation.











Photo 3



Photo 4. Interior showing rod bracing.







Photo 5. Interior showing rod bracing and moment connection.



Photo 6





Photo 7



Photo 8

UCSF







Photo 9





Appendix B

Checklists

	L	JC Ca	ampu	S: San Francisco –	Parnassus		Date:	4	September 201	9
	Buil	ding	CAA	N: 2213	Auxiliary CAAN:		By Firm:	Simps	Simpson Gumpertz & Heger	
	Bui	lding	Nam	e: CP Ammonia	Facility		Initials:	KDP	Checked:	KSM
E	Buildi	ng Ao	ddres	S: 2 Medical Center Way,	, San Francisc	;0	Page:	1	of	3
			C	A Collapse Prevention	SCE 41 Basic (l-17 Configu	iration	Check	list	
LC	W :	SEI	SMI	CITY						
BU	ILD	NG	SYS	STEMS - GENERAL						
						Descriptio	n			
С	NC	N/A	U	LOAD PATH: The structure contains a	complete, well-	defined load p	bath, including	structural el	ements and conn	ections, that
\odot	0	O	C	Sec. A.2.1.1. Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.1.1)	sociated with the	e mass of all e	elements of the	building to t	ne foundation. (C	ommentary:
				Comments: Load path is clear	ly defined fr	om roof to	foundation	I.		
					-					
С	NC	N/A	U	ADJACENT BUILDINGS: The clear dis	tance between	the building b	eing evaluated	and any ad	jacent building is	greater than
\odot	0	O	0	(Commentary: Sec. A.2.1.2. Tier 2: Sec	c. 5.4.1.2)	eismicity, 0.57		seismicity,	anu 1.5% in nigi	n seismicity.
				Comments: No surrounding bi	uildings witl	h 1.5% of s	hed height.			
C	NC	N/A	U	MEZZANINES: Interior mezzanine leve force-resisting elements of the main st	els are braced i ructure. (Comm	ndependently rentary: Sec.	from the main A.2.1.3. Tier 2	structure or Sec. 5.4.1.	are anchored to 3)	the seismic-
		U	0	Comments: Single story buildi	ing w/ no me	ezzanine			-,	
BU	ILDI	NG	SYS	TEMS - BUILDING CON	IGURATI	ON				
						Descriptio	n			
С	NC	N/A	U	WEAK STORY: The sum of the shear	strengths of th	e seismic-for	ce-resisting sy	stem in any	story in each dir	ection is not
0	Q	Θ	C	less than 80% of the strength in the ad	jacent story ab	ove. (Comme	ntary: Sec. A2	.2.2. Tier 2:	Sec. 5.4.2.1)	
				Comments: Single-story build	ing.					
С	NC	N/A	U	SOFT STORY: The stiffness of the se	ismic-force-res	isting system	in any story is	s not less th	an 70% of the se	eismic-force-
0	0	\odot	0	resisting system stiffness in an adjacent story above or less than 80% of the average seismic-force-resisting system stiffness of the three stories above. (Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.3. Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.2)						
				Comments: Single-story building.						
C	NC	N/A	U	VERTICAL IRREGULARITIES: All vert	ical elements ir	n the seismic-	force-resisting	system are	continuous to the	e foundation.
		U	U.	(Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.4. Tier 2: Sec	c. 5.4.2.3)					
				Comments: Single-story build	ing.					

UC Campus	: San Francisco –	Parnassus		Date:	4	September 201	9
Building CAAN	: 2213	Auxiliary CAAN:		By Firm:	Simpson Gumpertz & Heger		Heger
Building Name	CP Ammonia	Facility		Initials:	KDP	Checked:	KSM
Building Address	: 2 Medical Center Way,	, San Francisco	D	Page:	2	of	3
	ASCE 41-17 Collapse Prevention Basic Configuration Checklist						
	in a story relative to adjacent stories, excluding one-story penthouses and mezzanines. (Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.5. Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.4) Comments: Single-story building.						
C NC N/A U N C C C C n C	MASS: There is no change in effective nezzanines need not be considered. (Comments: Single-story build	e mass of more Commentary: S i ng.	e than 50% fro ec. A.2.2.6. T	om one story f Fier 2: Sec. 5.4	to the next. 9.2.5)	Light roofs, penth	nouses, and
C NC N/A U T ⊙ C C C t ¹	TORSION: The estimated distance be he building width in either plan dimens Comments: Symmetric single	tween the story sion. (Commenta story buildin	center of ma ary: Sec. A.2. IG.	ss and the sto 2.7. Tier 2: Se	ec. 5.4.2.6)	rigidity is less that	an 20% of

MODERATE SEISMICITY (COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN ADDITION TO THE ITEMS FOR LOW SEISMICITY)

GEOLOGIC SITE HAZARD

				Description
				2000 April 10
С	NC	N/A	U	LIQUEFACTION: Liquefaction-susceptible, saturated, loose granular soils that could jeopardize the building's seismic
\odot	\odot	\Box	\bigcirc	performance do not exist in the foundation soils at depths within 50 ft (15.2m) under the building. (Commentary: Sec. A.6.1.1.
				Tier 2: 5.4.3.1)
				Commenter Linuxfaction material is nonlinible
				Comments: Liquefaction potential is negligible.
С	NC	N/A	U	SLOPE FAILURE: The building site is located away from potential earthquake-induced slope failures or rockfalls so that it
0	0	0	\odot	is unaffected by such failures or is capable of accommodating any predicted movements without failure. (Commentary:
	-8-	-8-		Sec. A.o. I.Z. Tiel Z. 5.4.5.1)
				Comments: R+C study shows unlikely susceptibility.
_		N1/A		
C	NC	N/A	U	SURFACE FAULT RUPTURE: Surface fault rupture and surface displacement at the building site are not anticipated.
\odot	0	0	0	(Commentary: Sec. A.6.1.3. Tier 2: 5.4.3.1)
				Comments: Faults are adequately distant and do not pose a risk at this site.

UC Campus:	San Francisco – I	Parnassus		Date:	te: 4 September 2019		9
Building CAAN:	2213	2213 Auxiliary CAAN:		By Firm:	Simpson Gumpertz & Heger		Heger
Building Name:	CP Ammonia	Facility		Initials:	KDP	Checked:	KSM
Building Address:	2 Medical Center Way,	San Franciso	:0	Page:	3	of	3
	Ą	SCE 4	I-17				
Co	ollapse Prevention	Basic (Configu	iration	Check	list	
HIGH SEISMIC			OWING				
ITEMS FOR M	ODERATE SEISMIC	ITY)				Diffort	
FOUNDATION C	ONFIGURATION						
			Descriptio	n			
C NC N/A U O	VERTURNING: The ratio of the least	horizontal dim	ension of the	seismic-force-	resisting sys	tem at the foundation $(5, 4, 3, 3)$	ation level to
	Comments: The base/beight ra	ntio is slight	ly less that	n 0 652 in t	he short d	lirection	
	omments. The basemeight ra	lito is slight		n 0.05a m t	ne snort u		
C NC N/A U T	TIES BETWEEN FOUNDATION ELEMENTS: The foundation has ties adequate to resist seismic forces where footings, piles, and piers are not restrained by beams, slabs, or soils classified as Site Class A, B, or C. (Commentary: Sec. A.6.2.2. Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.3.4)						
		enneter cor	ninuous si	np looting.			

UC Campus:	San Francisco	Date:	4 September 2019			
Building CAAN:	2213 Auxiliary CAAN:		By Firm:	Simpson Gumpertz & Heger		Heger
Building Name:	CP Ammoni	Initials:	KDP	Checked:	KSM	
Building Address:	ling Address: 2 Medical Center Way, San Francisco, CA			1	of	2
ASCE 41-17						

Collapse Prevention Structural Checklist For Building Type S3

LOW AND MODERATE SEISMICITY

SEISMIC-FORCE-RESISTING SYSTEM

	Description
C NC N/A U	BRACE AXIAL STRESS CHECK: The axial stress in the diagonals, calculated using the Quick Check procedure of Section 4.4.3.4, is less than $0.50F_{y}$. (Commentary: Sec. A.3.3.1.2. Tier 2: Sec. 5.5.4.1)
	Comments: Axial stress is approximately 3.0Fy assuming grade 36 rods.

CONNECTIONS

-
Description
TRANSFER TO STEEL FRAMES: Diaphragms are connected for transfer of seismic forces to the steel moment frames. (Commentary: Sec. A.5.2.2. Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.2)
Comments: In-plane diagonal rods are provided.
STEEL COLUMNS: The columns in seismic-force-resisting frames are anchored to the building foundation. (Commentary: Sec. A.5.3.1. Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.3.1) Comments: Columns are anchored to foundation with rods.

HIGH SEISMICITY (COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN ADDITION TO THE ITEMS FOR LOW AND MODERATE SEISMICITY)

SEISMIC-FORCE-RESISTING SYSTEM

				Description			
С	NC	N/A	U	MOMENT-RESISTING CONNECTIONS: All moment connections are able to develop the elastic moment (F_yS) of the			
0	\mathbf{O}	\odot	\odot	adjoining members. (Commentary: Sec. A.3.1.3.4. Tier 2: Sec. 5.5.2.2.1)			
				Comments: Beam sizes are unknown.			
С	NC	N/A	U	COMPACT MEMBERS: All frame elements meet compact section requirements in accordance with AISC 360, Table B4.1.			
0	\odot	\odot	\odot	(Commentary: Sec. A.3.1.3.8. Tier 2: Sec. 5.5.2.2.4)			
				Comments: Beam and column sizes unknown.			

UC Campus:	IPUS: San Francisco – Parnassus			4 September 2019		
Building CAAN:	2213	Auxiliary CAAN:	By Firm:	Simps	on Gumpertz &	Heger
Building Name:	CP Ammo	Initials:	KDP	Checked:	KSM	
Building Address:	2 Medical Center Way, San Francisco, CA		Page:	2	of	2
ASCE 41-17						
Collapse Prevention Structural Checklist For Building Type S3						

HIGH SEISMICITY (COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN ADDITION TO THE ITEMS FOR LOW AND MODERATE SEISMICITY)

SEISMIC-FORCE-RESISTING SYSTEM

DIAPHRAGMS						
	Description					
C NC N/A U C C C C	OTHER DIAPHRAGMS: Diaphragms do not consist of a system other than wood, metal deck, concrete, or horizontal bracing. (Commentary: Sec. A.4.7.1. Tier 2: Sec. 5.6.5)					
	Comments: Diaphragm comprises horizontal rod bracing.					

CONNECTIONS

	Description
C NC N/A U C C © C	ROOF PANELS: Where considered as diaphragm elements for lateral resistance, metal, plastic, or cementitious roof panels are positively attached to the roof framing to resist seismic forces. (Commentary: Sec. A.5.5.1. Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.5) Comments: Diaphragm comprises horizontal rod bracing.
CNCN/AU ⊙CCC	WALL PANELS: Where considered as shear elements for lateral resistance, metal, fiberglass, or cementitious wall panels are positively attached to the framing and foundation to resist seismic forces. (Commentary: Sec. A.5.5.2. Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.5) Comments: Lateral-force resisting system comprises diagonal rod bracing in the long direction and moment-resisting frames in the short direction.





Appendix C

UCOP Seismic Safety Policy Falling Hazards Assessment Summary

_								
	UC Campus: UCSF – Parnassus				Date:	4 September 2019		
	Building CAAN:	2213	Auxiliary CAAN:		By Firm:	Simpso	n Gumpertz	& Heger
	Building Name:	CP Ammonia Facility		Initials:	KDP	Checked:	KSM	
	Building Address:	2 Medical Center Way, San Francisco			Page:	1	of	1
	UCOP SEISMIC SAFETY POLICY Falling Hazard Assessment Summary							

	Description
P N/A □ ⊠	Heavy ceilings, features or ornamentation above large lecture halls, auditoriums, lobbies, or other areas where large numbers of people congregate (50 ppl or more)
	Comments: No areas of congregation of over 50 people are located within the building.
P N/A □ ⊠	Heavy masonry or stone veneer above exit ways or public access areas
	Comments: No masonry or stone veneer is located near exit ways or public access areas.
P N/A	Unbraced masonry parapets, cornices, or other ornamentation above exit ways or public access areas
	Comments: There are no masonry parapets, cornices, or other ornamentation.
P N/A	Unrestrained hazardous material storage
	Comments: Ammonia is housed in a buried underground tank.
P N/A	Masonry chimneys
	Comments: No masonry chimneys are in the building.
P N/A	Unrestrained natural gas-fueled equipment such as water heaters, boilers, emergency generators, etc.
	Comments: No unrestrained equipment in the building.
P N/A	Other:
	Comments:
P N/A	Other:
	Comments:
P N/A	Other:
	Comments:

Falling Hazards Risk: Low





Appendix D

Tier 1 Calculations



 $\frac{\text{SEISMIC} \text{ WEIGHT}}{\text{NORTH & SOUTH NOWS}} = \frac{2(42)(15)(10 \text{ psf}) = 17.6 \text{ K}}{2(18)(15)(10 \text{ psf}) = 17.6 \text{ K}}$ EAST & WEST WALLS $\frac{2(42)(15)(15)(10 \text{ psf}) = 17.6 \text{ K}}{2(18)(15)(15)(10 \text{ psf}) = 6.1 \text{ K}}$ ROOF $\frac{2(42)(42+92)}{2(10 \text{ psf})} = 8.3 \text{ K}}$

WEIGHT TRIB TO ROOF = $0.5(12.6+6.1) + 8.3 = 18^{K}$ SEISMIN TEMANIN = $CS_aW = 1.4(1.836)(18) = 45^{K}$

SIMPSON GUMPERTZ & HEGER Engineering of Structures and Building Enclosures CLIENT UCSF SUBJECT CR AMMONIA OUL(K CHECKU SUBJECT CR AMMONIA OUL(K CHECKU TOENTAWO ON N&S LINES = 45/2 = 22.5^K TOO BERAFING $H_2^{"}\phi$ $H_3F_y = \pi(0.5)^2(36) = 7.1^K$ < 22.5^K IGNOVING TOENTATIONNO GOOD

STUICO PANELS In=100pst x 42' = 4.2K NO GOOD





Appendix E

Structural Drawing - S-02



