

Rangitikei District Council

DETAILED SEISMIC ASSESSMENT

46 HIGH STREET, MARTON

30 NOVEMBER 2021

CONFIDENTIAL






Question today Imagine tomorrow Create for the future

DETAILED SEISMIC ASSESSMENT 46 HIGH STREET, MARTON

WSP
Palmerston North
Level 2
49 Victoria Avenue
Palmerston North, New Zealand
+64 6 350 2500
wsp.com/nz

REV	DATE	DETAILS
2	30/11/2021	Updated to IL4

	NAME	DATE	SIGNATURE
Prepared by:	Rudi van Schalkwyk	30/11/2021	
Reviewed by:	Andre Ferreira	30/11/2021	
Approved by:	Robert Jeans	30/11/2021	

This report ('Report') has been prepared by WSP exclusively for Rangitikei District Council ('Client') in relation to the detailed seismic assessment of the RDC Finance Building ('Purpose') and in accordance with Short form Agreement with the Client dated 24/09/2021. The findings in this Report are based on and are subject to the assumptions specified in the Report and the Offer of Services dated 13/08/2021. WSP accepts no liability whatsoever for any reliance on or use of this Report, in whole or in part, for any use or purpose other than the Purpose or any use or reliance on the Report by any third party.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1	PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	2
1.1	INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.2	DSA SCOPE AND PURPOSE.....	2
1.3	%NBS CALCULATION	3
1.4	STRUCTURAL WEAKNESSES	3
2	SOURCES OF BUILDING DATA.....	4
2.1	DRAWING, CALCULATIONS & REPORTS	4
2.2	SITE GEOTECHNICAL INFORMATION.....	4
3	SITE AND BUILDING DECRPTION.....	5
3.1	SITE.....	5
3.2	BUILDING SIZE AND USAGE	5
3.3	STRUCTURAL SYSTEMS.....	5
4	ASSESSMENT INPUTS.....	8
4.1	MATERIAL PROPERTIES.....	8
4.2	SEISMIC LOADING	8
4.3	ANALYSIS METHDOLOGY.....	8
5	ASSESSMENT RESULTS	9
5.1	TABULATED FINDINGS.....	9
5.2	COMMENTARY ON SEISMIC RISKS	9
5.3	RECOMMENDATIONS	9
6	LIMITATIONS.....	10
	APPENDIX A – TECHNICAL SUMMARY	11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP has been engaged by the Rangitikei District Council to complete a Detailed Seismic Assessment (DSA) of the RDC Finance Building at 46 High Street. Our assessment has been completed in accordance with the MBIE document “The Seismic Assessment of Existing Buildings – Technical Guidelines of Engineering Assessments”, July 2017 (the ‘Red Book’).

The building is used as an office for general use with an approximate capacity of 20 staff. The building is therefore Importance Level 4 in accordance with the joint Australian/New Zealand standard Structural Design Actions Part 0, AS/NZS 1170.0:2002. It has hence been assessed for actions from a seismic event causing 1-in-2500-year ground shaking.

The Finance building was designed in the late 1970s. The structure comprises of timber roof trusses supported on timber framed walls. Lateral loads are transferred to plywood shear walls (plywood sheathed bracing panels) through the use of steel strap cross bracing within the roof. Reinforced concrete strip foundations support the plywood shear walls.

The results of the DSA find the building’s *Earthquake Rating* to be **15%NBS (IL4)** when assessed in accordance with the Guidelines. Therefore, this is a **grade E building** following the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE) grading scheme. Grade E buildings represent a risk to occupants 25 times greater than expected for a new building, indicating a very high life-safety risk exposure.

A building with an *Earthquake Rating* less than 34%NBS when assessed in accordance with Version 1 of the Guidelines (the ‘Red book’) fulfils one of the requirements for the Territorial Authority to consider it to be an Earthquake-Prone Building (EPB) in terms of the Building Act 2004. A building rating less than 67%NBS is considered as an Earthquake-Risk Building by the NZSEE. Rangitikei District Council Finance Building **is therefore categorised as an Earthquake Risk Building and does fall below the criteria that could categorise it as an EPB.**

The assessment identified the following structural weaknesses in the building:

Structural Component/System	Seismic Score (%NBS – IL4)	Structural Weakness Type	Mode of Failure
Roof level bracing	15%	CSW	Load path
Roof level bracing straps	25%	SW	Axial capacity
Ceiling level bracing straps	19%	SW	Axial capacity
Bracing panels	54%	SW	Shear capacity

Based on the outcomes of our assessment, we recommend strengthening the building to achieve a seismic rating 67%NBS (IL4).

A technical summary of the DSA is presented in Appendix A.

1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

WSP has been engaged by the Rangitikei District Council to complete a Detailed Seismic Assessment (DSA) of the RDC Finance Building at 46 High Street. This report summarises the inputs, methodology and findings of the assessment.

1.2 DSA SCOPE AND PURPOSE

A DSA is one of two forms of *Engineering Assessment* (the other being an ISA) permitted by the Earthquake Prone Building Methodology of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment to determine a building's *Earthquake Rating* (see Section 1.3) as part of the system for managing earthquake-prone buildings.

In July 2017 the latest revision of the "The Seismic Assessment of Existing Buildings – Technical Guidelines for Engineering Assessments" was issued. This is a document managed jointly by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, the Earthquake Commission, the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering, the New Zealand Structural Engineering Society and the New Zealand Geotechnical Society. The part of the technical guidelines covering concrete buildings is Section C5. This section is also known to the industry as the "C5 Red Book".

In November 2018 an updated revision to the technical guidelines Section C5 was issued. This is known to the industry as the revised guidelines or the "C5 Yellow Book". The C5 Yellow Book included substantial updates to the main body of the guidelines for the assessment of the primary structure for concrete buildings and included updates to several of the appendices, including the precast floor section (now appendix C5E), of the guidelines. The updates to the guidelines included lessons learned from the recent University research and the 2016 Kaikoura Earthquake as well as findings from the MBIE "Statistics House" Investigation.

A DSA aims to achieve an understanding of the likely behaviour of a building in earthquakes by:

- Quantifying the strength and deformation capacities of the various structural elements, and;
- Checking the building's structural integrity against the loads/deformations (demands) that would be used for the design of a similar building on the same site.

A building with an *Earthquake Rating* less than 34%NBS fulfils one of the requirements for the Territorial Authority to consider it to be an Earthquake-Prone Building (EPB) in terms of the Building Act 2004. For concrete buildings, the C5 Red Book must be utilised when determining the earthquake-prone status. A building rating less than 67%NBS is considered as an Earthquake-risk Building by the New Zealand Society of Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE).

Table 1 shows the grading system developed by the NZSEE for communicating the relative risk of a building compared to a that of a similar new building on the same site, based on the *Earthquake Rating* determined by a DSA.

Table 1: NZSEE grading system and relative risk description.

Percentage of New Building Standard (%NBS)	Alpha rating	Approx. risk relative to a new building	Life-safety risk description
>100 A+	A+	Less than or comparable to	Low risk
80-100	A	1-2 times greater	Low risk
67-79	B	2-5 times greater	Low to Medium risk
34-66	C	5-10 times greater	Medium risk
20 to <34	D	10-25 times greater	High risk
<20	E	25 times greater	Very high risk

1.3 %NBS CALCULATION

The %NBS Earthquake Rating for a building is found by a DSA from the following equation:

$$\%NBS = \text{Ultimate capacity (seismic)} \times 100\% / \text{ULS seismic demand}$$

The Ultimate capacity (seismic) of a building is taken as the minimum of:

- The probable capacity of the primary lateral structure of the building, including the impact of geotechnical issues, or;
- The probable capacity of structural elements, the failure of which could lead to a significant life safety hazard, or;
- The capacity of any Severe Structural Weaknesses (refer Section 1.4), or;
- The probable capacity of Secondary Structure and Non-Structural (SSNS) elements.

The items above are only considered should failure result in a significant life safety hazard. This is generally considered as failures that would result in collapse of all or part of a building and that would reasonably affect a number of people.

1.4 STRUCTURAL WEAKNESSES

A structural weakness (SW) is an aspect of the building structure and/or the foundation soils that scores below 100%NBS and the failure of which would be considered a significant life safety hazard.

The critical structural weakness (CSW) is the lowest scoring SW of a building. The %NBS of the CSW will be the %NBS of the building.

Severe structural weaknesses (SSW's) are a predefined list of SW's in the Guidelines that are not readily amenable to reliable assessment using usual methods. The Guidelines require the calculated probable capacity of these elements/systems to be halved.

2 SOURCES OF BUILDING DATA

The following documents and information were referred to for the assessment of the buildings.

2.1 DRAWING, CALCULATIONS & REPORTS

Drawings:

Several drawings labelled “Proposed additions to offices at Marton for the Rangitikei County Council” produced by Michael Payne & Associates with structural details by Payne, Sewell & Associates.

Drawing 1 - 5

2.2 SITE GEOTECHNICAL INFORMATION

a) Site sub-soil Class

The site subsoil class for this area may be conservatively assumed as *Class D* in the absence of a full geotechnical report. The natural site period of 0.4 seconds was considered in the assessment.

b) Liquefaction

No liquefaction potential

Based on page 8 of “Update of hazard Information for 2015 Lifelines Risk & Responsibilities Report” published by GNS Science in the “GNS Science Consultancy Report 2016/40 May 2016”

c) Soil bearing capacity

Assumed to be good ground to NZS3604.

d) Bounding properties

The building does not have any properties immediately adjacent to it.

3 SITE AND BUILDING DESCRIPTION

3.1 SITE

46 High Street, Marton, Manawatu-Whanganui.

Image from: <https://maps.rangitikei.govt.nz/IntraMaps90/?project=RangitikeiDC&module=Rangitikei>




3.2 BUILDING SIZE AND USAGE


The building consists of finance offices and has a footprint area of approximately 220m².


3.3 STRUCTURAL SYSTEMS

The single storey structure comprises of timber roof trusses supported on timber framed walls. Lateral loads are transferred to plywood lined bracing panels through the use of steel strap roof cross bracing. The plywood shear walls have reinforced concrete strip foundations. The building floor is constructed of timber flooring over timber joists, supported by timber bearer on piles footings.



+






MICHAEL PAYNE & ASSOCIATES
 24 Turere Place
 Wanganui
 Phone 55-738
 Registered Architect

PAYNE, SEWELL & ASSOCIATES
 Structural Engineers

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO OFFICES AT MARTON
 for the **RANGITIKEI COUNTY COUNCIL**

date	
scale	
revisions	
drawing	3



MICHAEL PAYNE & ASSOCIATES
 24 Turere Place
 Wanganui
 Phone 55-738
 Registered Architect

PAYNE, SEWELL & ASSOCIATES
 Structural Engineers

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO OFFICES AT MARTON
 for the **RANGITIKEI COUNTY COUNCIL**

date	
scale	
revisions	
drawing	4

4 ASSESSMENT INPUTS

4.1 MATERIAL PROPERTIES

Concrete probable strength	- 30MPa
Reinforcing probable strength	- 320MPa
Timber grade	- SG8

4.2 SEISMIC LOADING

In accordance with the Guidelines, the building has been subject to Ultimate Limit State (ULS) seismic demands that would be used to design a similar new building on the same site.

The current usage of the building means it is Importance Level 4 in accordance with the joint Australian/New Zealand standard Structural Design Actions Part 0, AS/NZS 1170.0:2002. A new building on this site would typically have a design life of 50 years.

The design life and importance level mean ULS demands results from a seismic event causing 1-in-2500-year ground shaking.

The seismic loading parameters for the assessment are

Parameter	Value	Remarks
Site sub-soil category	D	
Site hazard factor, Z	0.30	Marlon
Return period factor, R_u	1.8	1-in-2500 year ground shaking
Near fault factor, N(T,D)	1.0	No major fault lines in proximity

4.3 ANALYSIS METHDOLOGY

The building was assessed with an equivalent static force-based approach to determine member forces. Brace bays were modelled in SAP2000 to determine member forces.

When assessing the cross bracing, a compression limit was applied to ensure no compression load is resisted by the tension only elements and a non-linear analysis was undertaken.

The bracing panels were compared with similarly constructed new bracing systems utilising double sided plywood. The foundation beams of the bracing panels were analysed as beams on elastic foundations with two concentrated loads at the cast in strap hold down locations.

Taking the well detailed timber construction into account, a ductility of 2 was selected to obtain all seismic demands with a structural performance factor of 0.7.

Foundation pressures were calculated under combined bearing and overturning and a geotechnical reduction factor of 0.8 considered when calculating allowable bearing pressure versus ultimate bearing pressure for seismic or short duration loading.

5 ASSESSMENT RESULTS

5.1 TABULATED FINDINGS

Table 2 lists the %NBS rating for all structural elements assessed.

Table 2: Assessment results for individual components and/or systems.

Structural Component/System	Seismic Score (%NBS – IL4)	Structural Weakness Type	Mode of Failure	Seismic Score (%NBS-IL2)
Roof level bracing	15%	CSW	Load path	15%
Roof level bracing straps	25%	SW	Axial capacity	52%
Ceiling level bracing straps	19%	SW	Axial capacity	40%
Bracing panels	54%	SW	Shear capacity	100%
Bracing panel foundation	100%			100%
Floor structure	100%			100%
Building foundations	100%			100%
External walls	100%			100%

5.2 COMMENTARY ON SEISMIC RISKS

The results of the DSA find the building's *Earthquake Rating* to be **15%NBS (IL4)**. Therefore, this is a **grade E building** following the NZSEE grading scheme.

NZSEE guidelines state the relative risk of a grade D building compared to that of a similar new building on the same site is **25 times**. This indicates a very high life-safety risk exposure.

The assessment shows that the performance of the building is limited by the lack of a sufficient load path in the roof bracing layout. Lateral loads at the roof level are then transferred through the GIB lining in the skylight domes. This score can be improved significantly by installing a new roof cross brace to complete the load path within the roof system.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the legal minimum requirement for strengthening works is 34%NBS, we would strongly recommend strengthening to at least 67%NBS.

6 LIMITATIONS

This report ('Report') has been prepared by WSP New Zealand Limited ('WSP') exclusively for the Rangitikei District Council ('Client') in relation to the detailed seismic assessment of the Rangitikei District Council Finance Building ('Purpose') and in accordance with the Short Form Agreement with the client dated 24/09/2021 ('Agreement'). The findings in this Report are based on and are subject to the assumptions specified in the Report and our Offer of Service dated 13/08/2021. WSP accepts no liability whatsoever for any use or reliance on this Report, in whole or in part, for any purpose other than the Purpose or for any use or reliance on this Report by any third party.

In preparing this Report, WSP has relied upon data, surveys, analyses, designs, plans and other information ('Client Data') provided by or on behalf of the Client. Except as otherwise stated in this Report, WSP has not verified the accuracy or completeness of the Client Data. To the extent that the statements, opinions, facts, information, conclusions and/or recommendations in this Report are based in whole or part on the Client Data, those conclusions are contingent upon the accuracy and completeness of the Client Data. WSP will not be liable for any incorrect conclusions or findings in the Report should any Client Data be incorrect or have been concealed, withheld, misrepresented or otherwise not fully disclosed to WSP.

APPENDIX A – TECHNICAL SUMMARY

1. Building Information	
Building Name/ Description	RDC Finance Building
Street Address	46 High Street Road, Marton
Territorial Authority	Rangitikei District Council
No. of Storeys	1
Area of Typical Floor (approx.)	±220m ²
Year of Design (approx.)	Late 1970s
NZ Standards designed to	NZS1900
Structural System including Foundations	Roof strap bracing at purlin and ceiling level. Plywood bracing panels in both transverse and longitudinal directions.
Does the building comprise a shared structural form or shares structural elements with any other adjacent titles?	None
Key features of ground profile and identified geo- hazards	None
Previous strengthening and/ or significant alteration	None
Heritage Issues/ Status	None
Other Relevant Information	None

2. Assessment Information	
Consulting Practice	WSP New Zealand Ltd.
CPEng Responsible, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name CPEng number A statement of suitable skills and experience in the seismic assessment of existing buildings¹ 	Rudi van Schalkwyk (CPEng 1166463) - Senior Structural Engineer. Rudi has 14 years of combined consulting and construction experience and have designed a range of structures across multiple occupancies. He has undertaken numerous detailed seismic assessments across a wide range of engineering projects.
Documentation reviewed, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> date/ version of drawings/ calculations² previous seismic assessments 	Original architectural and structural drawings "Proposed additions to offices at Marton" Drawings 1 - 5
Geotechnical Report(s)	None
Date(s) Building Inspected and extent of inspection	03/11/2021
Description of any structural testing undertaken and results summary	None
Previous Assessment Reports	None
Other Relevant Information	None

¹ This should include reference to the engineer's Practice Field being in Structural Engineering, and commentary on experience in seismic assessment and recent relevant training

² Or justification of assumptions if no drawings were able to be obtained

3. Summary of Engineering Assessment Methodology and Key Parameters Used	
Occupancy Type(s) and Importance Level	Office for general use [occupancy Type B] Importance level 4
Site Subsoil Class	D
Summary of how Part C was applied, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the analysis methodology(s) used from C2 other sections of Part C applied 	Equivalent static analysis carried out in line with C2.7.1 Reduction factors chosen in line with C2.5.1 Probable strengths of concrete calculated in accordance with C5.4
Other Relevant Information	None

4. Assessment Outcomes	
Assessment Status (Draft or Final)	Final
Assessed %NBS Rating	15%NBS (IL4)
Seismic Grade and Relative Risk (from Table A3.1)	Grade E
Comment on the nature of Secondary Structural and Non-structural elements/ parts identified and assessed	None
Describe the Governing Critical Structural Weakness	Lack of load path for roof bracing forces the roof loads to be transferred through a GIB lined skylight dome to the shear wall.
If the results of this DSA are being used for earthquake prone decision purposes, and elements rating <34%NBS have been identified (including Parts) ³ :	Engineering Statement of Structural Weaknesses and Location The lack of load path through the roof and ceiling bracing levels.
Recommendations	We recommend strengthening to at least 67%NBS

³ If a building comprises a shared structural form or shares structural elements with other adjacent titles, information about the extent to which the low scoring elements affect, or do not affect the structure.