

EARTHQUAKE LOSS ESTIMATION METHODOLOGY

HAZUS[®] 99
User's Manual
ArcView[®] Version

Developed by:

Federal Emergency Management Agency
Washington, D.C.

Through a cooperative agreement with:
National Institute of Building Sciences
Washington, D.C.

Preface

Earthquakes pose a threat to life and property in 45 states and territories. As the United States has become more urbanized, more frequent smaller earthquakes in the 6.5 to 7.5 Magnitude range now have the potential of causing damage equal to or exceeding the estimated \$40 billion from the 1994 Northridge earthquake. Earthquakes in urban areas, such as Kobe, Japan and Izmit, Turkey, are grim reminders of the kind of damage that may result from larger earthquakes, like the San Francisco event of 1906 and eastern events that occurred in New Madrid in 1811-12.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency is committed to mitigation as a means of reducing damages and the social and economic impacts from earthquakes. FEMA, under a Cooperative Agreement with the National Institute of Building Sciences, has developed HAZUS[®]99 (HAZUS[®] stands for “Hazards U.S.”), the second edition of the standard, nationally-applicable methodology for assessing earthquake risk. Significant enhancements have been added to HAZUS[®]99, particularly, a disaster response application to facilitate the use of HAZUS[®] in the immediate post-disaster environment. HAZUS[®]99 and the preceding edition of the earthquake loss estimation methodology, HAZUS[®]97, represent the dedicated efforts of more than 130 nationally-recognized earthquake and software professionals.

HAZUS is an important component of FEMA’s *Project Impact*, a national movement to create safe and disaster-resistant communities. FEMA is making HAZUS[®] available to all states and communities, including the almost 200 now participating in *Project Impact*, and the private sector. Communities find HAZUS[®] to be a valuable tool in promoting a broader understanding of potential earthquake losses and in helping to build a community consensus for disaster loss prevention and mitigation.

Since the first release of HAZUS[®], FEMA has been expanding the capability of HAZUS[®] by initiating loss estimation models for flood and hurricane hazards. Preview versions of these flood and hurricane models are being readied for release in 2002.

I am pleased to disseminate this manual to state and local users.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael J. Armstrong". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "M".

Michael J. Armstrong
Associate Director for Mitigation
Federal Emergency Management Agency

Foreword

The work that provided the basis for this publication was supported by funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Institute of Building Sciences. The substance and findings of that work are dedicated to the public. NIBS is solely responsible for the accuracy of the statements and interpretations contained in this publication. Such interpretations do not necessarily reflect the views of the Federal Government.

The National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) is a non-governmental, non-profit organization, authorized by Congress to encourage a more rational building regulatory environment, to accelerate the introduction of existing and new technology into the building process and to disseminate technical information.

Individual copies or bulk rate orders of this report are available through the National Institute of Building Sciences. For information contact:

Philip Schneider
National Institute of Building Sciences
1080 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: 202-289-7800
Fax: 202-289-1092
E-mail: pschneider@nibs.org
Website: www.nibs.org

Claire Drury
FEMA
500 C Street, SW
Washington DC, 20472
Tel.: 202-646-2884
Fax: 202-646-2577
E-mail: claire.drury@fema.gov
Website: www.fema.gov

**© 1999, 1997 Federal Emergency Management Agency
(Secured by Assignment)**

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this document, in whole or in part, by any means, such as by any mechanical, photographic, or electronic process, or utilization of this document other than in its original form, such as by phonographic or tape recording, storage in a retrieval system or transmission for public or private use, or copying all or portions of this document for resale or redistribution, without written permission from the Federal Emergency Management Agency is strictly prohibited.

HAZUS® is a trademark of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

MESSAGE TO USERS

HAZUS is designed to produce loss estimates for use by state, regional and local governments in planning for earthquake loss mitigation, emergency preparedness and response and recovery. The methodology deals with nearly all aspects of the built environment, and with a wide range of different types of losses. The methodology has been tested against the experience from several past earthquakes and against the judgment of experts. Subject to several limitations noted below, HAZUS has been judged capable of producing results that are credible for the intended purposes.

Uncertainties are inherent in any such loss estimation methodology. They arise in part from incomplete scientific knowledge concerning earthquakes and their effect upon buildings and facilities, and in part from the approximations and simplifications necessary for comprehensive analyses. The range of uncertainty, possibly a factor of two or more, is best evaluated by conducting multiple analyses, varying certain of the input parameters to which losses are most sensitive. This *User's Manual* gives guidance concerning the planning of such sensitivity studies.

Users should be aware of the following specific limitations:

- HAZUS is most accurate when applied to a class of buildings or facilities, and least accurate if applied to a particular building or facility.
- Accuracy of losses associated with lifelines may be less than for losses associated with the general building stock.
- Based on several initial abbreviated tests, the losses from small magnitude (less than M 6.0) earthquakes appear to be overestimated.
- Uncertainty related to the characteristics of ground motion in the Eastern U.S. is high. Conservative treatment of this uncertainty may lead to overestimation of losses in this area, both for scenario events and when using probabilistic ground motion.
- Pilot and calibration studies have as yet not provided an adequate test concerning the possible extent and effects of landslides and the performance of water systems.
- The indirect economic loss module is new and experimental. While output from pilot studies has generally been credible, this module requires further testing.

HAZUS should be regarded as a work in progress. Additional improvements and increased confidence will come with further experience in using HAZUS. To assist us in further improving HAZUS, users are invited to submit comments on methodological and software issues by letter, fax or e-mail to:

Philip Schneider
National Institute of Building Sciences
1080 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: 202-289-7800
Fax: 202-289-1092
E-mail: pschneider@nibs.org

Claire Drury
Federal Emergency Management Agency
500 C Street, SW
Washington DC, 20472
Tel.: 202-646-2884
Fax: 202-646-2577
E-mail: claire.drury@fema.gov

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Earthquake Committee

Chairman, Robert V. Whitman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Roger Borchardt, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California
David Brookshire, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Richard Eisner, California Office of Emergency Services, Oakland California
William Holmes, Rutherford & Chekene, San Francisco, California
Robert Olson, Robert Olson & Associates, Inc., Sacramento, California
Michael O'Rourke, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York
Henry J. Lagorio, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California
Robert Reitherman, California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering, Richmond, California

Transportation Lifeline Subcommittee

Chairman, Michael O'Rourke, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York
Robert V. Whitman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts
David Brookshire, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Ian Friedland, MCEER, SUNY @ Buffalo, Buffalo, NY
John Mander, SUNY @ Buffalo, Buffalo, NY

Utility Lifeline Subcommittee

Chairman, Michael O'Rourke, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York
William Holmes, Rutherford & Chekene, San Francisco, California
Thomas O'Rourke, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
William Savage, Pacific Gas & Electric Co., San Francisco, California
Robert Reitherman, California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering, Richmond, California

Building Damage Subcommittee

Chairman, Robert V. Whitman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts
William Holmes, Rutherford & Chekene, San Francisco, California
Robert Olson, Robert Olson & Associates, Inc., Sacramento, California
Scott Lawson, Risk Management Solutions, Menlo Park, California
Robert Reitherman, California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering, Richmond, California

Casualty Subcommittee

Chairman, Robert Reitherman, California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering, Richmond, California
William Holmes, Rutherford & Chekene, San Francisco, California
Robert Olson, Robert Olson & Associates, Inc., Sacramento, California
Richard Eisner, California Office of Emergency Services, Oakland California
Henry J. Lagorio, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California

Project Oversight Committee

Chairman, Henry J. Lagorio,, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California
Arrietta Chakos, City of Berkeley, Berkeley, California
Donald H. Cheu, Kaiser Permanente, South San Francisco, California
Tom Durham, Central United States Earthquake Consortium, Memphis, Tennessee
Jerry A. Foster, ISO Commercial Risk Services, Inc., Scottsdale, Arizona
Edward Fratto, New England States Emergency Consortium, Wakefield, Massachusetts
Steven French, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia
Steve Ganz, Western States Seismic Policy Council, San Francisco, California
Alan Goldfarb, Berkeley, California
Jack Harrald, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.
Thomas Kinsman, City of Seattle, Construction & Land Use, Seattle, Washington
George Mader, Spangle Associates, Portola Valley, California
Shirley Mattingly, FEMA Region 9, San Francisco, California
Kent Paxton, San Mateo Area Office Emergency Services, Redwood City, California
John Smith, Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency, Framingham, Massachusetts
Douglas Smits, City of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina
J. Carl Stepp, Austin, Texas
Gerry Uba, Emergency Management Program, Metro, Portland, Oregon

Earthquake Loss Estimation Methodology Assessments, Development and Calibrations

Risk Management Solutions, Inc., Menlo Park, California

Scott Lawson, Project Manager; Mourad Bouhafs, Software Manager; Fouad Bendimerad, Jawhar Bouabid, Foued Bouhafs, Jason Bryngelson, Weimen Dong, Surya Gunturi, Dina Jabri, Guy Morrow, Hemant Shah, Chessy Si, Pane Stojanovski

Consultants

Charles Kircher, Technical Manager, Kircher & Associates, Mountain View, CA; Thalia Anagnos, Assistant Project Manager, and Guna Selvaduray, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA; Chris Arnold, Building Systems Development, Palo Alto, CA; Nesrin Basoz, K2 Technologies Inc; Catalino Cecilio and Martin McCann, Jack Benjamin & Associates; Hal Cochrane, Mahmoud Khater, EQE; John Mander, SUNY Buffalo; John McKean, Jerry Steenson and Bob Young, Colorado State University; Bryce Connick, Tom Desmond, John Eiding, Bruce Maison and Dennis Ostrom, G&E Engineering, Oakland, CA; John Egan and Maurice Power, Geomatrix, San Francisco, CA; Gerald Horner, Horner & Associates; Onder Kustu, Oak Engineering, Belmont, CA; Gregory Luth and John Osteraas, Failure Analysis Associates, Menlo Park, CA; Farzad Namien, Consultant; Aladdin Nassar, Consultant; Jeanne Perkins, Association of Bay Area Governments, Oakland, CA; Claire Rubin, Claire Rubin & Associates, Arlington, VA; Jean Savy, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory; Paul Sommerville, Woodward-Clyde, Pasadena, CA; Federico Waisman, EQE; Fred Webster, Consultant, Menlo Park, CA; Felix Wong, Weidlinger Associates

California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering

A. H-S Ang, University of California, Irvine, CA; Jonathan Bray, Armen Der Kiureghian, Jack Moehle, Raymond Seed and Brady Williamson, University of California, Berkeley, CA; Peter Gordon, Harry Richardson, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA; David Keefer,

U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA; Anne Kiremidjian, Helmut Krawinkler and Haresh Shah, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Portland Pilot Study

Dames & Moore, Inc.

Seattle, Washington: C.B. Crouse, Project Manager; Donald Ballantyne, Project Manager; Linda Noson, Assistant Project Manager; William Heubach, Greg Lammers, Eugene Trahern, Kenneth Winnick San Francisco, California: Jim Hengesh; Los Angeles, California: Alan Porush; Portland, Oregon: Douglas Schwarm; Santa Ana, California: Craig Tillman

Consultants:

Carl Batten, ECO Northwest, Portland, OR; James Beavers, Mitigation Solutions Technology, Inc., Oakridge, TN; Grant Davis, KPFF Consulting Engineers, Portland, OR; Matthew Katinsky and John Schlosser, Schlosser & Associates, Seattle, WA

Boston Pilot Study

EQE International

Irvine, California: Ron Eguchi, Principal-in-Charge, Paul Flores, Project Manager, Ted Algermissen, R. Augustine, Neil Blais, Don Ballantyne, Stephanie Chang, Kenneth Campbell, Ronald Hamburger, Jim Johnson, Mayasandra Ravindra, Tom Roche, Michael Rojanski, Charles Scawthorn, Hope Seligson, Solveig Thorvald; New Hampshire: Paul Baughman, James White

Consultants: Sam Liao and Steve Line, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Boston, MA; Adam Rose, Penn State University, University Park, PA

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Mitigation Directorate, Washington, D.C.

Margaret Lawless, Program Assessment and Outreach Division Director (1998-present);, Cliff Oliver, Program Policy and Assessment Branch Chief (1998-present);, Gil Jamieson, Risk Assessment Branch Chief (1994 -1998);, John Gamble, Program Development Branch Chief (1992 - 1993);, Claire Drury, Project Officer (1996 - present);, Fred Sharrocks, Project Officer (1994 - 1996);, Michael Mahoney, Project Officer (1992 - 1993);, Stuart Nishenko (1998 - present).

U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia

Paula Gori (1995 - 1998), John Filson (1992 - 1993)

National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington, D.C.

Philip Schneider, Director, Multihazard Loss Estimation Methodology Program; Bruce E. Vogelsinger, Vice-President; John Boyer, Project Manager; Barbara Schauer, Project Manager; Baldev Sikka, Administrative Assistant

What is New in HAZUS99?

- The ground motion model has been revised by implementing new algorithms for calculating the distance to the fault rupture plane and accounting for earthquakes that rupture across multiple fault segments. New attenuation functions have been added for Hawaii (Munson & Thurber) and the Eastern United States (Lawrence Livermore National Lab). Details of these changes are included in Chapter 4 of the *Technical Manual*.
- A new bridge model based on the nonlinear performance of bridges has been implemented along with a revised bridge classification scheme and updated national bridge inventory. Details of these changes are included in Chapter 7 of the *Technical Manual*.
- For the probabilistic analysis of building damage, revised fragility curves have been added that are compatible with the USGS probabilistic ground motion maps. These new fragility curves, however, are still under review by the Earthquake Committee. In addition, **HAZUS99** now has the capability to automatically compute annualized loss estimates for buildings. Details of these changes are included in Chapters 5 and 16 of the *Technical Manual*.
- HAZUS99 now includes a network analysis model for potable water systems. Although the model is fully functional, the results generated are still under review by the Utility Lifeline Subcommittee. Details of these changes are included in Chapter 8 of the *Technical Manual*.
- The indirect economic loss model has been improved to accommodate weekly and monthly inputs in the first two years after an earthquake event. Details of these changes are included in Chapter 16 of the *Technical Manual*.
- **HAZUS99** includes a new application that can directly link **HAZUS** with Tri-NET. This capability will allow **HAZUS** to monitor Tri-NET and to automatically create a study region and execute the analysis when an earthquake is broadcast. In addition, **HAZUS99** response and recovery capabilities have been enhanced with the addition of a “ground truthing” option. This special feature allows users to incorporate observed damage information for use in post-event operational response. Details of these changes are included in Chapter 9 and 12 of the *User’s Manual*.
- **HAZUS99** has been optimized for greater speed.
- In addition to several new summary reports, a comprehensive summary report of analysis results has been added. The report, about 20 pages in length, contains text and tabular data about the study region, the earthquake scenario selected, and the results.
- The capability to save and recall map workspaces has been added.
- Several databases in HAZUS99 have been added: updated USGS probabilistic ground motion maps and US source maps, a revised hospital database, a new national bridge inventory, an updated hazardous material site database and a new national railroad track database.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE EARTHQUAKE LOSS ESTIMATION METHODOLOGY	1-1
1.1 Overview of the Methodology	1-2
1.2 Earthquake Hazards Considered in the Methodology.....	1-4
1.3 Types of Buildings and Facilities Considered.....	1-5
1.4 Levels of Analysis	1-6
1.4.1 Analysis Based on Default Information	1-7
1.4.2 Analysis with User-Supplied Inventory.....	1-9
1.5 Assumed Level of Expertise of Users	1-10
1.5.1 When to Seek Help	1-10
1.6 Displaying Methodology Results	1-11
1.7 Uncertainties in Loss Estimates	1-13
1.8 Applying Methodology Products	1-13
1.9 Organization of the Manual	1-14
CHAPTER 2. INSTALLING AND STARTING HAZUS.....	2-1
2.1 System Requirements	2-1
2.1.1 Minimum System Configurations	2-1
2.1.2 Software Requirements.....	2-1
2.2 Installation.....	2-1
2.3 Upgrading from HAZUS97 to HAZUS99	2-8
2.4 Starting the Program	2-9
2.5 Uninstalling the Program	2-9
2.6 Program Basics	2-12
2.6.1 Menu Bar.....	2-12
2.6.2 Tool Bar	2-13

CHAPTER 3. RUNNING HAZUS WITH DEFAULT DATA.....	3-1
3.1 Defining the Study Region.....	3-1
3.2 Defining a Scenario Earthquake.....	3-6
3.3 Running an Analysis Using Default Data	3-9
3.4 Viewing Analysis Results.....	3-14
3.5 Default Databases and Default Parameters.....	3-17
3.5.1 Default Databases.....	3-17
3.5.2 Default Parameters	3-19
3.5.3 Viewing Default Parameters.....	3-20
CHAPTER 4. DATA NEEDED FOR MORE COMPLETE LOSS ESTIMATION STUDY.....	4-1
4.1 Developing a Regional Inventory.....	4-1
4.2 Standardizing and Classifying Data	4-4
4.3 Inventory Databases.....	4-6
4.4 Inventory Requirements	4-8
4.5 Relationship Between Building Types and Occupancy Classes	4-10
CHAPTER 5. COLLECTING INVENTORY DATA	5-1
5.1 Sources of Information	5-1
5.1.1 Potential Earth Science Hazards (PESH).....	5-2
5.1.2 General Building Stock.....	5-3
5.1.3 Occupancy to Model Building Type Relationships.....	5-6
5.1.4 Essential Facilities.....	5-7
5.1.5 High Potential Loss Facilities	5-8
5.1.6 User-Defined Structures.....	5-9
5.1.7 Lifelines	5-10
5.1.8 Inundation.....	5-12
5.1.9 Fire Following Earthquake	5-12
5.1.10 Hazardous Materials.....	5-12
5.1.11 Demographics.....	5-13
5.1.12 Direct Economic Loss Parameters	5-13
5.1.13 Indirect Economic Loss Parameters	5-15
5.2 Collecting Inventory Data	5-19

5.2.1	Sidewalk/Windshield Survey	5-20
5.2.2	Land Use Data	5-24
5.2.3	Aerial Photography.....	5-27
5.2.4	Discussions with Local Engineers and Building Officials.....	5-27
CHAPTER 6. ENTERING AND MANAGING DATA IN HAZUS.....		6-1
6.1	Importing GIS and Graphic Files	6-1
6.1.1	Opening ArcInfo Files in ArcView.....	6-1
6.1.2	Importing MapInfo Files in ArcView.....	6-2
6.1.3	Opening Atlas GIS Files in ArcView.....	6-2
6.1.4	Opening AutoCAD (*.dxf) Files in ArcView	6-2
6.1.5	Digitized Maps.....	6-2
6.2	Opening Database Files into HAZUS	6-2
6.2.1	The Import Database Utility.....	6-3
6.2.2	Instructions for Opening dBASE (*.dbf) Files in ArcView.....	6-6
6.2.3	Opening Excel (*.xls) Files in ArcView.....	6-8
6.2.4	Instructions for Importing Paradox (*.db) Files into ArcView	6-8
6.2.5	Instructions for Opening ASCII Delimited Files in ArcView.....	6-8
6.2.6	Instructions for Importing ASCII Fixed Length Files into ArcView	6-9
6.3	Adding Records to Site Specific Databases.....	6-9
6.3.1	Errors When Adding Records	6-11
6.4	Deleting Records from Site Specific Databases.....	6-12
6.5	Editing Records	6-12
6.5.1	Synchronizing Databases with Mapping Coordinates.....	6-14
6.6	Lifelines.....	6-14
6.6.1	Adding Lifeline Segments	6-14
6.6.2	Adding Highway Bridges	6-14
6.7	Specifying Hazard Maps.....	6-14
6.7.1	Modifying Census Tract Centroid Hazard Values	6-16
CHAPTER 7. DISPLAYING, MODIFYING AND MAPPING INVENTORIES.....		7-1
7.1	Editing a Database	7-1
7.2	Printing Out a Database	7-1
7.3	Modifying Occupancy to Model Building Type Relationships.....	7-1

7.3.1	Modifying the Mix of Age and Building Heights.....	7-3
7.3.2	Modifying the Mapping Scheme to Reflect Different Design Levels	7-5
7.4	Defining Different Mapping Schemes for Different Census Tracts.....	7-7
7.5	General to Specific Occupancy Mapping	7-7
7.5.1	Mapping a Database	7-9
CHAPTER 8. BUILDING-DATA IMPORT TOOL (BIT).....		8-1
8.1	Getting Your Data in the Right Format.....	8-1
8.2	Starting BIT.....	8-1
8.3	Specifying the Input File	8-2
8.3.1	Importing an ASCII Delimited Database	8-2
8.3.2	Importing a *.dbf Database	8-5
8.3.3	Importing a Fixed Length Field Database	8-6
8.4	Mapping Fields	8-8
8.5	Categorizing Data.....	8-10
8.5.1	Categorizing Number of Stories Data	8-11
8.5.2	Categorizing Year Built Data.....	8-13
8.5.3	Categorizing Occupancy Class Data	8-14
8.5.4	Categorizing Building Type Data.....	8-15
8.6	Aggregating the Database Statistics	8-17
8.7	Viewing the Results	8-18
8.7.1	Viewing Square Footage.....	8-18
8.7.2	Viewing and Using Mapping Schemes	8-19
8.7.3	Viewing Building Counts	8-21
8.7.4	Viewing and Editing Property Files	8-22
8.8	Querying Your Database	8-24
8.8.1	Errors with the Query Tool	8-27
8.9	Exporting a Database	8-28
CHAPTER 9. RUNNING HAZUS WITH USER SUPPLIED DATA.....		9-1
9.1	Defining the Study Region.....	9-1
9.2	Defining the Potential Earth Science Hazards	9-1
9.2.1	Defining Earthquake Hazard	9-2

9.2.2	Defining a Deterministic Scenario	9-3
9.2.3	Defining Probabilistic Hazard	9-8
9.2.4	User-defined Hazard	9-9
9.2.5	Choosing an Attenuation Function	9-9
9.2.6	Selecting An Earthquake Scenario	9-10
9.2.7	Viewing the Current Defined Hazard.....	9-11
9.2.8	Including Site Effects.....	9-12
9.2.9	Including Ground Failure.....	9-12
9.2.10	Modifying PESH Parameters	9-17
9.3	Running the PESH Option.....	9-18
9.4	Running the Direct Physical Damage Option	9-20
9.4.1	Structural Versus Non-structural Damage	9-21
9.4.2	Definitions of Damage States - Buildings.....	9-22
9.4.3	Definitions of Damage States - Lifelines	9-24
9.4.4	Fragility Curves - Buildings	9-25
9.4.5	Fragility Curves - Lifelines	9-26
9.4.6	Modifying Fragility Curves	9-28
9.4.7	Steps For Calculating Damage State Probabilities	9-29
9.4.8	Modifying Capacity Curves	9-30
9.4.9	Restoration Time	9-31
9.4.10	Potable Water System Analysis Model (POWSAM).....	9-33
9.5	Running the Induced Physical Damage Option.....	9-34
9.5.1	Running the Inundation Module	9-35
9.5.2	Running the Fire Following Earthquake Module	9-39
9.5.3	Hazardous Materials Analysis Option	9-41
9.5.4	Debris Estimates	9-41
9.5.5	Types and Sources of Debris.....	9-41
9.6	Running the Direct Social and Economic Loss Module	9-44
2.1.1	Casualty Estimates.....	9-45
2.1.2	Estimates of Displaced Households Due to Loss of Housing Habitability and Short-Term Shelter Needs	9-50
2.1.3	Direct Economic Loss	9-58
9.7	Running the Indirect Economic Loss Module	9-67
2.1.4	Economic Sectors	9-68
2.1.5	Running the Indirect Economic Loss Module with a Synthetic Economy	9-68
2.1.6	Running the Indirect Economic Loss Module with IMPLAN Data	9-73

9.8	Dealing with Uncertainty.....	9-75
CHAPTER 10. VIEWING, REPORTING AND GROUND TRUTHING THE RESULTS.....		10-1
10.1	Guidance for Reporting Loss Results.....	10-1
10.2	Module Outputs	10-2
10.3	Potential Earth Science Hazards.....	10-2
10.3.1	Ground Motion Descriptions	10-6
10.4	Direct Physical Damage - General Building Stock	10-6
10.5	Direct Physical Damage - Essential Facilities	10-11
10.6	High Potential Loss Facilities.....	10-12
10.7	Direct Physical Damage - Lifelines.....	10-13
10.8	Induced Physical Damage.....	10-20
10.9	Direct Economic and Social Losses	10-30
10.10	Indirect Economic Impacts	10-36
10.11	Summary Reports	10-37
10.12	Ground-Truthing the Results.....	10-40
CHAPTER 11. EXTENSION OF HAZUS TO OTHER NATURAL HAZARDS.....		11-1
11.1	Vulnerability to Natural Hazards.....	11-1
11.2	Damage From Hurricane, Tornado and Flood	11-2
11.2.1	Hurricanes.....	11-2
11.2.2	Tornadoes.....	11-4
11.2.3	Floods	11-4
11.3	Key Factors in Estimating Losses from Natural Hazards.....	11-5
11.4	Accessing Supplemental Hazard Maps.....	11-7
11.5	Hurricane Data Maps.....	11-8
11.6	Flood Data Maps	11-10
11.7	Elevation Data Maps	11-11
11.8	Land Use/Land Cover Data Maps	11-11
11.9	FEMA Shelter Data.....	11-12

11.10	Street/Roadway Data Maps	11-12
CHAPTER 12.	QASEM AND GROUND TRUTHING THE RESULTS	12-1
12.1	Launching QASEM	12-1
12.2	QASEM Options	12-1
12.2.1	The Pager File	12-1
12.2.2	Monitoring Type	12-2
12.2.3	Study Region Type	12-2
12.2.4	Study Region Radius	12-3
12.2.5	Monitor Settings	12-3
12.3	QASEM Results	12-3
REFERENCES		1

