Seismic Vulnerability Evaluation of Existing Structures Using the Rapid Visual Screening Method in Malang City

Dzul Fikri Muhammad^{*}, Imam Alfianto, Edi Santoso, and Boedya Djatmika

Department of Civil Engineering and Planning, Universitas Negeri Malang

Abstract. Indonesia is characterized by its volcanic mountain ranges and bordered by several tectonic plates. This geographical setup makes Indonesia susceptible to both tectonic and volcanic earthquakes. The Indonesian National Standardization Body issued the latest earthquake regulations in 2019, leading to changes in the seismic hazard values used as reference in seismic design. As a result of these regulation changes, seismic load designs have been updated. While these regulations are applicable to the planning of new buildings, it's equally important to assess existing structures to determine if they can withstand the updated seismic loads. This research focuses on evaluating the vulnerability of older buildings constructed before the implementation of the new earthquake regulations. The assessment method employed is Rapid Visual Screening (RVS). This study was conducted in Malang City, as it falls within an area of moderate to high seismicity. After conducting the RVS method, a numerical analysis was performed on a sample of buildings for comparison. The research findings indicate that the examined buildings are still capable of withstanding the updated seismic loads.

1. Introduction

Several tectonic plates encircle Indonesia's territory. Among the plates present are the Pacific Plate, Indian-Australian Plate, Eurasian Plate, and Indian Plate. The boundaries of these tectonic plates can be calculated using active earthquake zones, mountain mass movement zones, volcanic zones, magmatic zones, and hydrocarbon-rich zones[1]. The active earthquake zones have been classified by Indonesia through the earthquake recording agency, the Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysics Agency, and have been presented on their website. Consequently, Indonesia's regions are susceptible to both tectonic and volcanic earthquakes[2,3].

The Indonesian National Standardization Body issued the latest earthquake regulations in 2019, replacing the 2012 regulations. In this update, there was an increase in the values of PGA (Peak Ground Acceleration), Ss, and S1 on the seismic map compared to the 2010 map. With these increased values, the regions in Indonesia have become more susceptible to earthquakes. In the 2017 seismic map, Malang City had a spectral acceleration response value

^{*} Corresponding author: dzulfikrimuhammad.ft@um.ac.id

[©] The Authors, published by EDP Sciences. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

of 0.4 g for long periods (S1) and 0.9 g for short periods (Ss) [3]. According to FEMA P-154, Malang City is classified as a Moderate High Seismicity Region[4].

Regulation	PGA	Ss	S1
SNI 1726 2012	0,3 – 0,4 g	0,7 – 0,8 g	0,3 – 0,4 g
SNI 1726 2019	0,4 – 0,5 g	0.8 - 0.9 g	0,4 – 0,5 g

 Table 1. Change of parameters in SNI 1726-2012 and SNI 1726-2019 for Malang City.

Meanwhile, recent active faults have been detected at the border of Surabaya and Sidoarjo, not far from Malang [1]. According to Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysics Agency data, Malang City has suffered several large earthquakes. As a result, the sensitivity to earthquake hazards of buildings developed in Malang City must be assessed using seismic standards from 2012 and 2002.

No.	Date	Location	Magnitude (SR)
1	21 December 2022	Malang Regency	4,8
2	6 December 2022	Jember	6
3	10 April 2021	East Malang	6,1
4	15 April 2020	Malang Regency	4,3
5	19 February 2019	Malang Regency	5,6
6	10 March 2019	Malang Regency	5,2
7	8 August 2018	Malang Regency	5,1
8	8 April 2017	Malang City	3,7
9	16 November 2016	Malang Regency	6,1
10	26 July 2016	Malang Regency	6,3

Table 2. Earthquake Near Malang Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysics Agency Data

Existing building vulnerability assessment is divided into two methods: thorough assessment and quick evaluation utilizing Rapid Visual Screening (RVS). Rapid Visual Screening (RVS) is a technique for identifying, collecting, and filtering structures that may be seismically hazardous[4]. The RVS procedure employs direct survey methods and data collection with forms. Surveyors collect data by making visual inspections of the building's outside and its interior. Building information, images, sketches, and earthquake-related data are all collected on data collection forms. A final score is produced based on the data acquired during the study to evaluate the seismic vulnerability state. A full building vulnerability evaluation requires structural civil engineering professionals, expensive, and a large amount of time. On the other hand, using RVS allows for a faster assessment and is less expensive resources [5,6].

Various researchers have used RVS evaluations for building vulnerability checks [7–10]. RVS can be used to assess a building's seismic resilience without the requirement for expertise or specialized software[11]. The RVS results provide an early insight of whether the building is still earthquake-resistant or if structural reinforcement is required[12].

However, because the use of RVS for building assessments is relatively uncommon in Indonesia, more research on the use of RVS in buildings is required. As a result, the focus of this research is on assessing existing buildings using RVS. The study will provide information about the seismic resiliency of these structures. If a building does not fulfill the RVS standards, more action, such as numerical analysis with the assistance of experts, may be required.

2. Method

This research will utilize the Rapid Visual Screening building assessment method based on FEMA 154. Figure 1 illustrates the workflow of this study.



Fig. 1. Study Workflow

This study started with literature reviews and data collection. This process begins with reviewing the earthquake parameters in Malang city, gathering building data, and referencing previous RVS research. RVS is conducted based on FEMA -154 regulations.

In the RVS analysis, there are several steps as follows[9]:

- 1. Verify building information.
- 2. Conduct a construction survey to determine the building's shape, number of floors, and floor plan sketch.
- 3. Capture photos of the building.
- 4. Identify the building's function.
- 5. Review soil data.
- 6. Identify the surrounding conditions of the building, irregularities in the building, and potential hazards from exterior elements.
- 7. Make notes if there are conditions that may affect the survey.
- 8. Determine the construction material, load-bearing system, and seismic force-resisting system to determine the FEMA construction type and circle the basic score from the survey form.
- 9. Calculate the final score for the building to determine its vulnerability.

The overall building score goes from 0 to 7, with higher ratings indicating superior seismic performance and a lower risk of collapse. The proposed final score criterion is S_{min} . Smin criteria based on FEMA-154 forms. Buildings with a final score of S_{min} or less should be explored further with extensive study by seismic structural design experts.

						Add	ress:										
							_						2	Zip:			
						Othe	er Identi	ifiers:									
						Build	ding Na	me:									
						Use:											
						Latit	tude:					Longitu	ide:				
Pł	OTOGRA	ч				Ss:						S1:					
						Scre	ener(s)	:				D	ate/Tim	e:			
						No. S	Stories:	: Abov	e Grade	c	Below	w Grade	e:	Yea	r Built:		E
						Tota	Floor	Area (se	q. ft.):	1 V V		70		Code	e Year:		
						Add	itions:		ione L	J Yes, Y	ear(s) B	uit:					_
						Occi	upancy	: Ass	embly	Commer	rcial	Emer. S School	iervices	Пе	istoric	Shelf	er
						1		Utili	ty .	Warehou	use	Resider	ntial, # Ur	nits:	ovenanet	н	
						Soil	Type					ID [NK		
						-	type.	Hard Rock	Avg	Dens	ie Si	uff S oil S	Soil S	oor // Soil	DNK, ass	ume Type	D.
						Geol	logic Ha	azards:	Liquefac	tion: Yes	No/DN	(Lands	lide: Yes	/No/DNK	Surf. R	upt.: Yes/	No/
				-		Adia	cency:			ounding		Falling H	lazards fr	om Taller	r Adiacen	t Building	
						Irreg	gularitie	s:		ertical (typ	pe/sever	ity)					_
						Exte	rior Fal	ling		nbraced (Chimney	15		avy Clade	ding or H	eavy Ver	ee
										ther:			U . #				
	SKETCH						Additiona	al sketch	es or cor	nments o	n separa	ate page	1				
	SKETCH	BASIC	SCOR	RE, MO	DIFIEF	IS, AN	Additiona ND FIN	al sketch	es or cor	nments o 1 SCO	n separa	ate page		0144	0140	1154	
MA BUILDING TYPE Do	SKETCH E Not W1 now	BASIC W1A	SCOR	RE, MO	DIFIER S2 (BR)	53 (LM)	Additiona ND FIN S4 (RC SW)	al sketch NAL LI S5 (URM INF)	es or cor EVEL	nments o 1 SCOI C2 (SW)	n separa RE, S (URM (URM INF)	ete page	PC2	RM1 (FD)	RM2 (RD)	URM	
MA BUILDING TYPE Do Kisic Score	SKETCH E Not 4.1	BASIC W1A 3.7	SCOR W2	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3	DIFIER S2 (BR) 2.2	S, AN S, AN S3 (LM) 2.9	Additiona ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2	al sketch NAL LI S5 (URM INF) 2.0	EVEL (MRF) 1.7	nments o 1 SCOI C2 (SW) 2.1	n separa RE, Si C3 (URM INF)	ete page L1 PC1 (TU) 1.8	PC2	RM1 (FD) 1.8	RM2 (RD) 1.8	URM	M
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do K K sic Score Vere Verfacil Irregularity. V:r	SKETCH E Not 4.1 -1.3 -0.6	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.8	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7	DIFIER S2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6	S3 (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8	Additiona ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6	al sketch IAL LI S5 (URM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6	EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -1.0 -0.6	1 SCOI 2.1 -1.1 -0.6	n separa RE, Si C3 (URM INF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5	ete page L1 PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6	PC2	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5	-
EINA BUILDING TYPE Do K asic Score Ivere Vertical Irregularity, VL1 an Irregularity, VL1 an Irregularity, PL1	SKETCH E Not W1 -1.3 -0.6 -1.3	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9	DIFIER S2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0	Additiona ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8	al sketch VAL LI S5 (URM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7	EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7	1 SCOI 22 (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9	n separa RE, S (URM INF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6	ete page PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5	-
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do asic Score www. Vertical Imegularity, VLr oderate Vertical Imegularity, VLr an Imegularity, PLr e-Code	SKETCH E Not Not 4.1 -1.3 -0.8	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9	SCOF W2 3.2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5	DIFIER S2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5	S3 (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7	Additional ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6	al sketch NAL LI S5 (URM URM -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2	EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4	1 SCOI 22 (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7	n separa RE, S; (URM INF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1	ete page PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1	8 2 1 1 1 1
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do asis Score www.er Verfall Irregularity. V _{LT} an Irregularity. P _{LT} no Code ost-Bondmark dotare k	SKETCH E Not 4.1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.3 -0.8 1.5 0.2	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6	SCOF W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6	DIFIER S2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 1.4 0.9	S , AN S , A S (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.2	Additiona ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 1.9 0.9	al sketch IAL LI S5 (URM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9	EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6	1 SCOI 22 (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8	n separa RE, Si (URM INF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7	ete page PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.4 2.1	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6	8 2 1 1 1 1
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do market for the second s	SKETCH E Not Now 4.1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.3 -0.8 1.5 0.3 0.0	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3	E, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4	DIFIER S2 (BR) -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 1.4 0.9 -0.5	S , AN S , AN S (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0	Additiona ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 1.9 0.9 -0.4	al sketch IAL LI S5 (URM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5	EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 -0.2	1 SCOI 22 (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.2	n separa RE, Si (URM INF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4	tr PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3	1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do asic Score evere Vertical Irregularity, V _{L1} dodrate Vertical Irregularity, V _{L1} an Irregularity, PL re-Code sci-Benchmark oil Type A or B oil Type C [1-3 stories] oil Type E [1-3 stories]	SKETCH E Not W1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.3 -0.8 1.5 0.3 0.0 -0.5	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.4 -0.7	DIFIER S2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 1.4 0.9 -0.5 -0.7	S3 (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA	Additiona ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 1.9 0.9 -0.4 -0.7	al sketch IAL LI S5 (URM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 -0.6	EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -1.0 -0.5 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 -0.2 -0.6	C2 SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.2 -0.8 -0.2	RE, Si (URM NF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 -0.4	ET PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.6	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3	
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do salic Score vere Vertical Irregularity, V ₁ : an Irregularity, V ₂ : or Code sel-Banchmark bi Type E (-3 stories) bi Type	SKETCH E Not -1.3 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -0	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2	SCOF W2 3.2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.7 0.5	DIFIER S2 (BR) -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 1.4 0.9 -0.5 -0.7 0.5	SS, AN S3 (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9	Additiona S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 1.9 0.9 -0.4 -0.7 0.5	al sketch S5 (URM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 -0.5 -0.6 0.5	es or con EVEL - (MRF) -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 -0.2 -0.6 0.3	C2 SW 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.2 -0.8 0.3	n separa RE, S ₁ (URM INF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 -0.4 0.3	L1 PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5 0.2	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 0.3	RM2 (PD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2	
IMA BUILDING TYPE Do sisic Score vere Verfact Inregularity, V _{LT} dorate Vertical Inregularity, V _{LT} an Irregularity, P _{LT} e-Code st-Banchmark st-Banchmark st-Banchmark st-Banchmark st-Banchmark st-Banchmark Market P 3 stories) I Type E (1-3 stories)	SKETCH E Not Not 4.1 -1.3 -0.8 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2	SCOF W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.7 0.5	DIFIER 22 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 1.4 0.9 -0.5 -0.7 0.5	S S S S S S S S S S	Additiona S4 (RC SW) -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 1.9 0.9 -0.4 -0.7 0.5	al sketch S5 (UReal INF) -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 -0.6 0.5	es or con EVEL - 1.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 -0.2 -0.6 0.3	2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.2 -0.8 0.3	n separa RE, S ₀ (URM II.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 -0.4 0.3	L1 PC1 (TU) 1.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5 0.2	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 0.3	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 0.2	
MA BUILDING TYPE Do sic Score were Vertical Irregularity. V _{L1} dorate Vertical Irregularity. V _{L1} s-Code st-Benchmark Il Type E (1-3 stories) Il Type E (2-3 stories) Il Type E (2-3 stories) Il Type E (2-3 stories) MAL LEVEL 1 SCORE, SL(2) XTENT OF REVIEW	SKETCH E Not 4.1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.5 -0.	BASIC W1A -1.3 -0.9 1.9 0.6 0.1 -0.8 1.2	SCOF W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1,1 -0.7 -0.5 1.4 0.6 0.4 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHEI	DIFIER S2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 1.4 0.9 -0.5 -0.7 0.5 R HAZ/	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9	Additions ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	al sketch IAL LI S5 (URRM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 -0.5	es or con EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -0.6 0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 0.2 -0.5 0.3 ACT	C2 (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.7 2.1 -0.8 0.07 2.1	n separa RE, Si (URM NF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 -0.4 0.3	L1 PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.3 -0.5 0.2	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 0.4 -0.4 -0.4 0.3	RM2 (PD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.3	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 0.2	
MA BUILDING TYPE Do K sic Score vere Verfical inegularity. V _{LT} odorate Verficial regularity. V _{LT} an inegularity. P _{LT} e-Code s-Benchmark Il Type E (> 3 stories) Il Type E (> 3 stories) Il Type E (> 3 stories) NAL LEVEL 1 SCORE, S _{LT} ≥: XTENT OF REVIEW terior: □ Partial	SKETCH Image: Sketch and a state of the state of t	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHEI Are Ther	DIFIEF S2 (8%) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.7 0.5 R HAZJ/	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9	Additions ND FIN S4 (RC SW) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	al sketch IAL LI S5 (URW) INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	EVEL - C1 (MRF) -1.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 0.2 -0.5 0.3 ACT Detail	C2 (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.8 -0.7 2.1 -0.7 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.3	n separa RE, S (URM NF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 -0.4 0.3 EQUIF	Lt PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3 RED	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5 0.2 Require	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4	RM2 (PD) 1.8 -1.0 0.5 2.1 0.5 2.1 0.5 2.1 0.3	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2	
An A BUILDING TYPE Do K Stoic Score K stoic Score K stoic Score K Score K Score K Score K Score K Score K Score	SKETCH E Not W1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.3 -0.8 1.5 0.3 0.0 -0.5 Start -0.5	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 1.2 -0.8 1.2	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.9 2.3 0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO 31 2.3 1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHEI Are Ther Detailed	DIFIER \$2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.5 R HAZ// e Hazardi Structura	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2	Addition ND FIN (RC SW) -0.6 -0.6 -0.8 1.9 -0.7 0.5 Trigger A ation?	al sketch S5 (URM INF) -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 0.5 -0.6 0.5	es or cor EVEL - C1 (MRF) -0.5 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 -0.2 0.3 ACT Details - Y4	1 SCOI 2 (SW) 2 1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.2 0.3 ION RE	n separa RE, S, (URM) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.3 EQUIF tural Exc	Lt PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3 RED	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 0.2 Required Required	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3 Uilding	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 0.2	
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do asic Score were Verfaci Irregularity. V ₁₇ dorarle Verical Irregularity. V ₁₇ an Irregularity. P ₁₇ e-Code sc-Banchmark bil Type E (1-3 stories) bil Type E (2-3 stories) bil Type E (2-3 stories) minum Score. Sum INAL LEVEL 1 SCORE, SL12. XTENT OF REVIEW tetrior: Partial tetrior: Partial tetrior: Yes UT De Stories Bil Type Store (1-2) Bil Type Store (1-	SKETCH Image: Sketch state Not W1 -1.3 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 1.5 0.0 0.0 Visible No Visible No	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -0.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2	SCOR W2 3.2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHEI Are There Pour	DIFIER \$2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 -0.7 0.5 0.7 0.5 R HAZ// Structura Structura	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -0.8 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2 -1.2	Addition ND FIN S4 (RC SW) -0.6 -0.8 -0.8 1.9 0.9 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 Trigger A	al sketch NAL LI S5 (URM INF) -0.9 -0.5 -0.6 0.5 -0.6 0.5	es or cor C1 0///F7 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 -0.2 -0.6 0.3 ACT Detailal Y Y	nments o 1 SCOU (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.8 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.2 -0.8 0.3 ION Rit ed Struct	n separa RE, S ₀ (URM MF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 0.3 EQUIF tural Ev. wn FEN less tha	L1 PC1 (TU) -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3 RED aluation A buildi	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5 0.2 Require ng type o	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 0.3 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 r other b	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 0.2	
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do masic Score vere Vertical rregularity, V _{x1} oderativ Vertical rregularity, V _{x1} oderativ Vertical rregularity, V _{x1} oderativ Vertical regularity, V _{x1} of Ode Di Type E (-3 stories) Di Type Source: Di Typ	SKETCH E Not W1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.3 -0.8 1.5 0.5 0.0 -0.5 Intervention 1.6 Same: All Side	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2 0.6 0.1 -0.8 1.2 -0.8 1.2	SCOR W2 3.2 -1.3 -0.9 2.3 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 -1.2 0.8 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MOC 51 (MRF) -0.9 -0.5 -0.4 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHEL Detailed Pour cut-out -0.5	DIFIEF 22 (BR) -0.8 -0.8 -0.5 1.4 0.9 -0.5 -0.7 0.5 R HAZ/ ding pole	S, AM S3 (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 ARDS S That T I Evalua tial (un) n) from his form his f	Addition: S4 (SW) 22 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.9 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 -0.5	al sketch S5 (UPed 1047) -0.9 -0.9 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 -0.6 0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	es or con EVEL - C1 0.6 0.7 -0.6 0.3 ACT Details Y L MCF - 0.6 0.3	Imments of C2 (SW) 2.1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.7 2.1 -0.8 -0.3 CON RI ed Struct ess, softer	n separa RE, S _i (URM MF) 1.4 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 0.3 EQUIF tural Evo Wm FEM less that hazards	Lt PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3 RED aluation n cut-off present	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5 0.2 Require ng type o	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.6 0.3 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 0.3	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3 uilding	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 0.2	
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do asic Score ever Vertical Irregularity, V ₁ : an irregularity, V ₂ : an irregularity, V ₁ : an irregu	SKETCH E Not now 4.1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.5 -1.6 -1.5	BASIC W1A -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2 5 -1.2 -0.9 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1	SCOR W2 3.2 -1.3 -0.9 2.3 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 -1.2 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO S1 (MPF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 -1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.4 -0.7 -0.5 OTHEI Pour cut-our Failing -Pour cut-our -Pour	DIFIER S2 (8R) 2.2 -1.0 0.5 1.4 0.9 0.5 R HAZJ R HAZJ (ing potesting phasade) ff, if know	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 NA RDS 5 That T I Evaluat Interlation n) from ta	Addition S4 (NC) SW -0.6 -0.6 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 -0.5	al sketch s5 (Ureal INF) -0.9 -0.9 -0.7 -0.2 NA 0.9 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	es or con EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -1.0 0.6 0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 0.3 ACT Details □ YY YY N Details □ Details	1 SCOI 2 (SW) 2 1 -1.1 -0.6 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 0.3 ION RI ed Struct s, unknow s, s, score and Nonet	n separa RE, S, C3 (URM NF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 0.7 -0.4 0.3 EQUIF tural EV wm FEM hazards	ate page 17 PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 NA 0.3 RED aluation A buildin present Evaluation	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 0.2 Require g type o	RM11 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7	RM2 (PD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3 uilding ded? (cfc)	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.5	
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do saic Score EVA BUILDING TYPE Do Saic Score EVA Statistic Irregularity, V _{LT} an Irregularity, V _{LT} an Irregularity, V _{LT} an Irregularity, V _{LT} an Irregularity, V _{LT} ocCode Di Type E (1-3 stories) Di Type E (1-	SKETCH Not 4.1 -0.3 -0.5 1.3 -0.6 0.0 -0.5 1.6 Sam:	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -0.9 1.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2 D.6 -0.1 -0.8 1.2 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8 ial ered	E, MO S1 (MRP) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.5 -0.4 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHELI Are Ther Dotalled ■ Dotalled ■ Dot	DIFIEF 22 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.7 R HAZ/J e Hazard: ding pole hazard: ding pole hazard: ding pole hazard: ding pole hazard: ding pole hazard: ding pole hazard: ding pole hazard: ding pole ding pole di	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 ARDS s That I I Evalut ital (uni n) from tal	Additions ND FIN 84 (%C 5%) 90.9 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.5 -0.8 -0.5 -0.8 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.	al sketch AL LI S5 (URM INF) 2.0 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 0.8 -0.7 -0.2 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5	es or con EVEL - C1 (MRF) 1.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 1.9 0.6 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.3 0.5 0.3 0.5 0.3 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5	1 SCOU 2 (SW) 2 1 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.0 0.8 0.3 0.3 0.0 0.8 0.3 0.3 0.0 0.8 0.3 0.9 0.0 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8	n separa RE, S, C3 (URM NF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.1 NA 0.7 -0.4 -0.4 0.3 EQUIF tural Ex- wm FEM hazards turatural 1 -0.8 -0.5 -0	ate page cr PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 0.5 NA 0.3 RED aluation A buildi present I Evalua azards	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5 -0.2 Require ng type o tion Reco	RM1 (FD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3 -0.4 -0.6 -0.7 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7	RM2 (PD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3 Uilding ded? (ch	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.4 -0.3 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.5	
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do asic Score evere Vertical rregularity, V _{L1} docrate Vertical lregularity, V _{L1} fan Irregularity, V _{L1}	SKETCH E Not Not -1.3 -0.8 -1.3 -0.5 -1.6 -1.5 -0.5 -1.6 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -1.6 -0.5 -0.	BASIC WIA 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9	SCOR W2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8	RE, MO S1 (MRP) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 -0.7 0.5 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 -0.4 -0.5 -0.4 -0.5 -0.5 -0.4 -0.5 -0.5 -0.4 -0.5	DIFIEF S2 (BR) 2.2 -1.0 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	S, AN S3 (LM) 2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 S That T I Evalue mageldet s from ta adds or Sk mageldet	Additional S4 (RC 500) 2.2 -1.0 0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.5 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.7	al sketch JAL L1 55 (URM 1NF) 2.0 -0.6 -0.7 -0.2 -0.6 0.9 -0.5 -0.	ess or corr EVEL - (MRF) -0.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.6 -0.7 -0.6 -0.3 -0.6 -0.3 -0.7 -0.4 -0.5 -0.3 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	1 SCO 22 (SW) 2.1 -0.8 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 0.3 0.8 0.3 0.8 0.3 0.8 0.3 0.8 0.3 0.8 0.3 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9	n separa C3 (URM NF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 0.7 -0.4 0.3 EQUIF tural Ev wm FEM less that hatazards iructural h	tr PC1 (TU) 1.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3 RED aluation A buildin n cut-off present I Evaluas hazards a zards e	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.5 0.2 Require ng type o tion Rec identified xist that	RM1 (#D) 1.8 -1.0 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.4 -0.6 0.3 r other b commenn that sho	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3 uilding ded? (cf. build be et uire mitig	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.5	1
EMA BUILDING TYPE Do asic Score howere Vertical Imegularity. V ₁₇ an Imegularity. P ₂₇ e-Code as-Banchmark Ji Type E (2) a stores) inimum Score, Saw INAL LEVEL 1 SCORE, S ₁₇ 2: XTENT OF REVIEW terior: Data Stores) INAL LEVEL 1 SCORE, S ₁₇ 2: Type Source: Diff theorem Score Stores Diff theorem Score	SKETCH E Not Non 4.1 -1.3 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.3 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -0.8	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -0.8 -0.9 0.6 -0.9 0.6 1.2 0.9 1.2 CP?	SCOR W2 3.2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8 ial ered	RE, MOC S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 -0.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHEL Pour curve Pour curve Signification S	DIFIEF S2 (BP() 2.2 -1.0 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 -1 -1.2 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.3 0.0 -0.7 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.3 0.0 -0.7 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.8 -0.7 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9	Additional S4 (%C) (%Y) 2.2 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.6 -0.8	al sketch JAL L1 S5 (UR4) IMF) -0.9 -0.8 -0.7 NA 0.9 -0.5	es or cor EVEL - Ct 1.7 -0.6 0.5 0.3 ACT Detailá Y N N Detailá Q N N N N N N N N N N N N N	1 SCOI 2 (3W) 2 1 -1.1 -0.6 0.9 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.2 0.8 -0.2 0.8 -0.3 ION RE es, softer i s, socre o o o o o o o o o o o o o	n separa C3 (URM MF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 -0.4 0.7 -0.4 0.3 EQUIF tural Ev wm FEM less that hazards turatural H curatural H cu	te page 1.1 PC1 (TU) 1.8 -1.0 0.9 -0.5 -0.4 2.1 0.9 -0.5 NA 0.3 RED aluation A buildin n cut-off present I Evalua zards e is not ne	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.5 0.2 Require ng type o tion Rec cidentifice identifice	RM1 (PD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.6 -0.7 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.6 -0.4 -0.6 -0.4 -0.6 -0.4 -0.6 -0.4 -0.6 -0.4 -0.5 -0.4 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	RM2 (RD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.3	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.4 -0.3 -0.2 -0.5 -0	
	SKETCH Not 4.1 -0.8 -0.8 -0.5 1.6 Sam: -0.8 -0.8 No	BASIC W1A 3.7 -1.3 -0.8 -1.2 -0.9 1.2 -0.9 0.6 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.9 -0.1 -0.8 -0.9 -0.1 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.2 -0.9 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.8 -0.9 -0.1 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.9 -0.1 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.8 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1 -0.1	SCOR W2 3.2 -1.3 -0.8 -1.1 -0.9 2.3 0.9 -0.3 -1.2 0.8 ial ered io io	RE, MOO S1 (MRF) 2.3 -1.1 -0.7 -0.9 -0.5 1.4 0.6 -0.4 -0.7 0.5 OTHEL Are Ther Detailed Geological Geological Geological Signition the s	DIFIEF S2 (BR) 2.2 -0.8 -0.8 -0.5 -0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0.5 -0.7 -0.5 -0	2.9 -1.2 -0.8 -1.0 -0.7 1.0 0.3 0.0 NA 0.9 NA RDS That T I Evalua I Evalua I Total (unin) 0 S That T I Evalua I S That T I Evalua	Addition ND FIN S4 (RC SW) -0.6 1.9 0.9 -0.4 ation? less S ₁₂ less S ₁₂ eterioratio	al sketch S5 (URM INF) 0.9 -0.6 0.7 -0.2 0.7 -0.2 0.5 -0	es or con EVEL - Ct (MFR) -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 0.3 -0.7 Details -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.7 -0.4 -0.5 -0.7 -0.4 -0.5 -0.	1 SCOI 2 (5W) 2 1 -0.5 -0.9 -0.7 2.1 -0.8 -0.2 -0.8 -0.2 -0.8 -0.3 ION RI ed Struct s, unknon s, s, score od Alonst s, nonstru lalled eva n, nonstru -0.0 -0.0 -0.0 -0.7 -0.5 -0.9 -0.7 -0.7 -0.5 -0.9 -0.7 -0.5 -0.9 -0.7 -0.5 -0.9 -0.7 -0.8 -0.2 -0.8 -0.3 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9 -0.9 -0.9 -0.8 -0.9	n separa RE, S, C3 (URA NF) 1.4 -0.8 -0.5 -0.6 -0.7 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.4 -0.3 EQUIE tural EV tural EV tural State tuructural helauation structural helauation	True page PC1 (TU) 1.8 -0.6 -0.8 -0.4 -0.4 -0.5 NA 0.3 RED aluation n cut-off present Evaluat azards e is not ne h azards	PC2 1.5 -0.9 -0.6 -0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 2.4 0.7 -0.3 0.2 Require g type o tion Rec cidentifice xis that to cessary	RM11 (PD) 1.8 -1.0 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.5 2.1 0.3 -0.4 -0.5 0.3 -0.4 -0.6 -0.3 -0.3 -0.4 -0.6 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.7 -0.5 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7 -0.7	RM2 (PC) 1.8 -1.0 -0.7 -0.5 2.1 0.8 -0.4 -0.7 0.3 0.3 uilding ded? (cf uuld be me ing uire mitig uire mitig DNIK	URM 1.2 -0.8 -0.5 -0.1 NA 0.6 -0.3 -0.3 0.2 Deck one) valuated ation, but	

Fig. 2. FEMA-154 RVS Example Form (Moderate High Seismicity)

There are several forms in FEMA-154 based on seismicity region. Determining seismicity region based on spectral acceleration response. Every form has final score. The equation of the final score in RVS method is,

Final Score (S_{L1}) = Basic Score + Modifiers Score (1)

Basic Score : Basic score from building type

Modifiers Score : Building Condition (irregularity, Pre-Code, Soil Type)

Determining building capability of withstanding the updated seismic loads with equation (2),

 $\begin{array}{ll} S_{L1} \geq S_{min} \geq S_{\ cutoff} \\ S_{L1} & : \ Final \ Score \\ S_{min} & : \ Minimum \ Score \\ S_{cutoff} & : \ Cutoff \ Score \ (about \ 2.0) \end{array}$

(2)

The final score obtained from RVS Form basic score and modified score. The Minimum Score was calculated by considering the worst conceivable combination of soil type, vertical and plan abnormalities, and building age. Cutoff score is the acceptable probability of collapse in existing buildings, which is again roughly equivalent to a value of S of about 2.0. The existing buildings to be inspected are structures located in Malang City. These buildings are the Civil Engineering Department Laboratory, the Faculty of Economics Building 1, the Faculty of Economics Building 2, the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences Building, and the Laboratory Elementary School of Malang State University. Table 3 and Table 4 for determine the seismicity region and building type for determine FEMA RVS form.

Seis	smicity Region	Spectral Acceleration Response, S _s (Short-period, or 0,2 seconds)	SpectralAccelerationResponse, S1 (long-period, or1,0 seconds)				
	Low	Less than 0,25 g	Less than 0,1 g				
	Moderate	Greater than or equal to 0,25 g but less than 0,5 g	Greater than or equal to 0,1 g but less than 0,2 g				
	Moderately High	Greater than or equal to 0,5 g but less than 1,0 g	Greater than or equal to 0,2 g but less than 0,4 g				
	High	Greater than or equal to 1,0 g but less than 1,5 g	Greater than or equal to 0,4 g but less than 0,6 g				
	Very High	Greater than or equal to 1,5 g	Greater than or equal to 0,6 g				

Table 3.	Seismicity	Region	based	on Ss	and S ₁
	1	0			

Table 4. FEMA Building Type

FEMA I	Building Type
W1	Light wood frame single- or multiple-family dwellings of one or more stories in height
W1A	Light wood frame multi-unit, multi-story residential buildings with plan areas on each
	floor of greater than 3,000 square feet
W2	Wood frame commercial and industrial buildings with a floor area larger than 5,000
	square feet
S1	Steel moment-resisting frame
S2	Braced steel frame
S3	Light metal frame
S4	Steel frame with cast-in-place concrete shear walls
S5	Steel frame with unreinforced masonry infill walls
C1	Concrete moment-resisting frame
C2	Concrete shear wall
C3	Concrete frame with unreinforced masonry infill walls
PC1	Tilt-up construction
PC2	Precast concrete frame
RM1	Reinforced masonry with flexible floor and roof diaphragms
RM2	Reinforced masonry with rigid floor and roof diaphragms
URM	Unreinforced masonry bearing-wall buildings
MH	Manufactured housing

3. Result and Discussion

The readings of the Spectral Acceleration Values $S_s = 0.87 \text{ g}$ and $S_1 = 0.4 \text{ g}$ based on the building's location indicate that the reviewed buildings are situated on type D soil with Moderate High Seismicity classification. Occupation, Soil Type, Building Type, and Seismicity region show at Table 5

No	Building	Occupation	Soil	Building	Seismicity
			Туре	Туре	Region
1	Civil Engineering Department	School	SD	C1	Moderate
	Laboratory				High
2	Faculty of Economics Building	School	SD	C1	Moderate
	1				High
3	Faculty of Economics Building	School	SD	C1	Moderate
	2				High
4	Faculty of Mathematics and	School	SD	C1	Moderate
	Natural Science Building				High
5	Laboratory Elementary School	School	SD	C1	Moderate
	of Malang State University				High

Table 5. Building Occupation, Soil Type, FEMA Building Type, and Seismicity Region

No	Building	C1 Final	C1 Smin	Final	Cut	Result
		(SL1)		Use	Score	
1	Civil Engineering Department	2.9	0.3	2.9	2	OK
	Laboratory					
2	Faculty of Economics Building 1	2.9	0.3	2.9	2	OK
3	Faculty of Economics Building 2	2.9	0.3	2.9	2	OK
4	Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Science Building	2.9	0.3	2.9	2	OK
5	Laboratory Elementary School of Malang State University	2.9	0.3	2.9	2	OK

Table 6. RVS Final Score for Buildings

The final score for each building was obtained from basic score C1 building type (1.7), Plan irregularity (-0.7), and Post Benchmark (1.9).

 $S_{L1} = 1.7 \text{-} 0.7 \text{+} 1.9 = 2.9$

 $S_{min} = 0.3$

Use $S_{L1} = 2.9 \ge 2$ (OK)

All of buildings that assessed has same structure and irregularities. The structure is concrete frame with column and beam structural member.

Level 1

FEMA P-154 Data Collection	on Forn	n								M	ODE	RAT	ELY	HIGI	I Sei	smic	ity
						Add	ress:	Semar	ang st.	05 M	lalang						
	1-1-1			1			-						Z	ip:			
						Oth	er Identi	fiers:		ofFor		ee Dui	Idina				
			1	17		Bui	School	me: <u>P</u>	acuity	OT ECO	onomi	cs Bu	liaing .	L			
			11	1-1		Lati	tude:					Longitu	de:				
						Ss:					_	S1:	-				
						Scr	eener(s)	:				D	ate/Time	: 12	-07-20	23	
		D				No. Tota	Stories: al Floor	Abov Area (se	ve Grade q. ft.):	_	Belov	w Grade		Yea	r Built: e Year:	2008 (2002	EST
		and the	1	1		Add	litions:		lone	Yes, Y	'ear(s) B	uilt: _		-			
		C. A.				Occ	upancy	Ass Indu Utili	embly ustrial ty	Comme Office Wareho	use	Emer. S School Residen	htial, #Ur	Ц Н G	istoric overnmer	□ Shelt nt	er
						Soil	Туре:	Hard Rock	Avg Rock	Den: Soi	c v se Si I S]D [tiff S oil S	JE Disoft President Soil S]F D cor If oil	NK DNK, ass	ume Type	D.
						Geo	logic Ha	azards:	Liquefac	tion: Yes	/No/DN	K Lands	lide: Yes	No/DNK	Surf. Ru	upt.: Yes/1	No/DNK
						Adj	acency:		D Po	unding		Falling H	lazards fro	om Taller	Adjacen	t Building	
	_		_	_		Irreg	gularitie	s:	□ Ve Ve Pla	rtical (ty an (type)	pe/sever	ity) _					
						Exte Haz	erior Fal ards:	ling		nbraced arapets	Chimney	rs	Hea	ivy Clade endages	ding or H	eavy Ven	eer
	_		-	-	_	0	MMENT	ç.		her:							_
		-	-			1.0		0.									
			Т														
	_			_		4											
						-											
SK	ETCH						Additiona	al sketch	es or con	nments o	n separa	ate page					
	BA	ASIC S	sco	RE, MO	DIFIER	RS, A	ND FIN	AL LI	EVEL 1	SCO	RE, S	L1					
FEMA BUILDING TYPE Do Not Know	W1	W1A	W2	S1 (MRF)	S2 (BR)	S3 (LM)	S4 (RC SW)	S5 (URM INF)	C1 (MRF)	C2 (SW)	C3 (URM INF)	PC1 (TU)	PC2	(FD)	RM2 (RD)	URM	мн
Basic Score	4.1	3.7	3.2	2.3	2.2	2.9	2.2	2.0		2.1	1.4	1.8	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.2	2.2
Moderate Vertical Irregularity, VL1	-0.8	-0.8	-0.8	-0.7	-0.6	-0.8	-0.6	-0.9	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.9	-0.6	-0.6	-0.8	NA
Plan Irregularity, PL1	-1.3	-1.2	-1.1	-0.9	-0.8	-1.0	-0.8	-0.7	-0.7	-0.9	-0.6	-0.8	-0.7	-0.7	-0.7	-0.5	NA
Pre-Code	-0.8	-0.9	-0.9	-0.5	-0.5	-0.7	-0.6	-0.2	-04	-0.7	-0.1	-0.4	-0.3	-0.5	-0.5	-0.1	-0.3
Post-Benchmark	1.5	1.9	2.3	1.4	1.4	1.0	1.9	NA 0.0	1.9	2.1	NA 07	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.1	NA 0.6	1.2
Soil Type E (1-3 stories)	0.0	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5	0.0	-0.4	-0.5	-0.2	-0.2	-0.4	-0.5	-0.3	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	-0.5
Soil Type E (> 3 stories)	-0.5	-0.8	-1.2	-0.7	-0.7	NA	-0.7	-0.6	-0.6	-0.8	-0.4	NA	-0.5	-0.6	-0.7	-0.3	NA
Minimum Score, SMM	1.6	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	1.4
FINAL LEVEL 1 SCORE, $S_{L1} \ge S_{MIN}$									2,9								
EXTENT OF REVIEW				OTHER	R HAZ	ARDS	5		ACT	ON R	EQUIF	RED					
Exterior: Partial	All Sides [Aeria	al	Are There	Hazard	s That	Trigger A	•	Detaile	d Struc	tural Ev	aluation	Require	d?			
Interior: None	Visible [_ Ente	red	Detailed	Structura	il Evalu	ation?		Ve Ye	s, unkno	wn FEM	A buildin	ng type o	other b	uilding		
Soil Type Source: D				L Poun	ding pote	ntial (ur	nless SL2	>	H Ye	s, score	less tha	n cut-off					
Geologic Hazards Source:				Fallin	o hazards	s from t	aller adia	cent		s, ouler	Idzdius	present					
Contact Person:				buildi	ng			_	Detaile	d Nons	tructura	I Evalua	tion Rec	ommen	ded? (ch	eck one)	
LEVEL 2 SCREENING PERE		12		Geok	icant dan	rds or S	ioil Type	F	□ Ye	s, nonst	ructural h	nazards	identified	that sho	uld be ev	aluated	
	CAMEL	•••	. 1	L orgin	nuchural s	vstem	no nor allu	110		, nonstru	uctural h	azards e	xist that	may requ	ire mitia	ation, but	а
and a second secon		AT N-		the si	loola a s				_	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1.				9		
Nonstructural bazarda?		No No		the si	rootarara	101011			dei	tailed ev	aluation	is not ne	cessary	d F			
Nonstructural hazards? Yes		No No	,	the si						tailed ev , no non	aluation structura	is not ne al hazard	cessary Is identifi	ed [] DNK		
Nonstructural hazards? Yes Where information	cannot be	V No	l, scr	the si	note the	e follow	ving: ES	ST = Esti	de No imated or	tailed ev o, no non r unrelia	aluation structura	is not ne al hazard <u>OR</u>	ecessary Is identifie DNK = D	o Not Ki	DNK	le desk	

Rapid Visual Screening of Buildings for Potential Seismic Hazards

Fig. 3. Faculty of Economics Building 1 FEMA-154 RVS Form (Moderate High Seismicity)

Exterior hazard data from the assessment are shown at table 7 below. There are unbraced chimneys, parapets, heavy cladding, and others for exterior hazard type. Exterior hazards indicate that in the event of an earthquake, the exterior has the potential to pose a collapse.

No	Building	Unbraced	Parapets	Heavy	Other
		Chimneys		Clading	
1	Civil Engineering Department				
	Laboratory				
2	Faculty of Economics Building 1		\checkmark	\checkmark	
3	Faculty of Economics Building 2			\checkmark	
4	Faculty of Mathematics and Natural				
	Science Building				
5	Laboratory Elementary School of				
	Malang State University				

Table 7. Exterior Hazard

4. Conclusion

- a) The buildings under inspection are classified in the Moderate High Seismicity Zone, according to FEMA-154.
- b) All assessed buildings have a low risk of collapsing due to earthquakes because the final assessment scores for these buildings are above the minimum threshold.
- c) FEMA RVS forms can be used with Ss and S1 data from the latest earthquake regulations from Indonesia National Standard
- d) The irregularity factor in buildings, the post-benchmark, and the type of soil affect a building's vulnerability to earthquakes.

References

- 1. D. Irawan, B. Suswanto, A. R. Amalia, and D. Iranata, IOP Conf Ser Mater Sci Eng 930, (2020)
- 2. Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum tentang Peta Zonasi Gempa, 8 (2010)
- 3. PUSGEN (Pusat Studi Gempa Nasional) Pusat Litbang Perumahan dan Permukiman, *Peta Sumber Dan Bahaya Gempa Indonesia Tahun 2017 (Map of Indonesia Earthquake Sources and Hazards in 2017)* (2017)
- B. Lizundia, S. Durphy, M. Griffin, A. Hortacsu, B. Kehoe, K. Porter, and B. Welliver, NCEE 2014 - 10th U.S. National Conference on Earthquake Engineering: Frontiers of Earthquake Engineering (2014)
- 5. M. Danish, Z. Mohammad, H. Gupta, M. Shariq, and A. Masood, 3rd International Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering & Technology 1 (2014)
- 6. D. Perrone, M. A. Aiello, M. Pecce, and F. Rossi, Structures 3, 57 (2015)
- 7. E. Wahyuni, P. Aji, and F. Budi, IPTEK Journal of Proceedings Series 0, 19 (2017)
- 8. C. Rojahn, C. Scawthorn, T. Anagnos, K. Wong, and C. D. Poland, 1 (2002)
- 9. D. W. D. Hartanty, 197 (2015)
- S. Agustin, Z. Djauhari, and R. Suryanita, Jurnal Rekayasa Sipil (JRS-Unand) 16, 38 (2020)
- 11. C. Scawthorn, T. Anagnos, K. Wong, C. Rojahn, and C. D. Poland, 62 (1989)
- 12. A. R. Dwi Pratama, J. W. Soetjipto, and K. Krisnamurti, Jurnal Teknik Sipil Dan Perencanaan 23, 114 (2021)