

Breakout Session 3: New Zealand Earthquake

- **What new questions raised by these events require basic research?**
 - What are **tolerable impacts**?
 - Who should be involved in decision making?
 - What should be the performance requirements?
 - Liquefaction – understanding, processes, effects on buildings and buried utilities (civil infrastructure); multiple occurrences at same site, multiple design-level events
 - How do we model probabilistically for ‘unlucky events’?
 - Effects of vertical accelerations (source, path and site effects), 3D shaking effects, implications for seismic isolation design, near fault effects



Japan and NZ Earthquakes RAPID and Research Needs Workshop
Arlington, VA Feb 9 and 10, 2012



What new data are available as a result of these events?

- Data from events on multiple faults
- Attenuation relationships, stress drop, directionality, source depth
- Performance of URM and heritage buildings
 - technical issues, response of groups of buildings, neighbors retrofitting together, area-wide fixes
 - community perspectives of value and expectations regarding response
- Fragilities of all building types – most complete set of data yet collected
- Prevalence of precast concrete structures, 3D effects, diaphragm de-seating, lessons regarding detailing



Japan and NZ Earthquakes RAPID and Research Needs Workshop
Arlington, VA Feb 9 and 10, 2012



- **What unique aspects of these events require the development of a focused research program?**
 - Finish the validation of developing new structural systems for Chch rebuild. From lab to market
 - So long since last disaster that there was no existing community experience – how do you build latent capability?
 - What can be learnt from earthquake sequence effects? Stress loading
 - How to respond after first event and when to expect continuing sequence?
 - How to account for sequence effects when applying building placards?
 - Speed to reshape a recovery paradigm. Learning from Sept 2010 that was applied in Feb 2011
 - NZ's unique insurance penetration has slowed recovery and leads to questions of portability of experiences
 - EQC now broke, remove government insurance?
 - Political view to not retreat from insurance
 - Implications of being well insured on building standards



Japan and NZ Earthquakes RAPID and Research Needs Workshop
Arlington, VA Feb 9 and 10, 2012



- **What are the important lessons from these larger than expected events for the U.S., Japan and New Zealand?**
 - Deterministic – extreme conservatism?
 - Should there be a minimum/lower bound hazard level? M6.5 at 10 km?
 - Recovery issues – how to recover when major city loses its city center?
 - Land use planning, technical guidance, quantification of hazards



Japan and NZ Earthquakes RAPID and Research Needs Workshop
Arlington, VA Feb 9 and 10, 2012



Why research collaborations with NZ?

- Major US research investment in Antarctica
- Similar built environment
- Similar code/design philosophies
- Tectonics very similar, soils/sands similar, analogies between Southern California and Canterbury plains
- Long standing successful collaborations, ease to quickly act
- Lots of face-to-face interactions previously that are now easy to leverage
- Free sharing of information, international researchers welcomed
- US researchers to be cognizant of NZ research Canterbury Earthquakes research plan

Priorities

- Recovery for major urban earthquake
- Tolerable impacts
 - Acceptable performance
 - Defining Hazard levels
- Liquefaction processes and effects
- Gathering and analyzing databases:
 - Damaged buildings: URM, Precast, RC
 - Businesses, schools, tourism, rugby
 - Utilities
 - Performance of damaged structures