Western States Seismic Policy Council
2015 Policy Recommendation Implementation Survey Results

In lieu of asking for an annual report of seismic activities and accomplishments, WSSPC requested response to this survey to establish the status of adoption and implementation of each adopted policy recommendation in every member state, province, and territory as of November, 2015. The survey was emailed to all members (Emergency Management and Geological Survey Directors and Seismic Commission Liaisons) and Representatives (State Earthquake Program contacts). The survey questions are based upon the facilitation and communication section of the policy recommendations, in the full policy recommendation versions that include the Facilitation and Communication, Assessment, and History sections. The survey results are summarized in this document.
Respondents:
Responses were received from at least one member agency for 14 of the 18 WSSPC states/provinces/territories (78%), representing 23 of the 39 member agencies (59%). Some states* provided a joint response from all member agencies. No responses were received from Arizona, New Mexico, the Northern Mariana Islands or Yukon Territory.

The following table shows which agencies responded (either individually or as a group). EM = emergency management, GS = geologic survey, SC = seismic council or committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/TERRITORY/PROVINCE</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>REPLIES</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(combined w/SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(combined w/SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>GU</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(combined w/ EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(combined w/SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(combined w/SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(combined w/EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>YT</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The term "state" will be used in this document to represent state/province/territory
If any one of the responding member agencies has fulfilled the policy objective, the state is considered to have implemented that policy. Data has been edited so that the 4 states that provided two separate responses have been given one response using the following matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Single value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes - yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes - no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes - N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes – no response</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no - no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no - N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no – no response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A – no response</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response – no response</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies:
The policies are organized by category rather than in numerical order. A project to implement Policy 14-5 (Earthquake Emergency Handbook for First Responders and Incident Commanders) under the category of Emergency Response Support is currently underway and was not included in the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Policy Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Reduction Strategies</td>
<td>15-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Identification and Assessment</td>
<td>15-1, 15-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Monitoring and Early Warning</td>
<td>14-3, 14-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Codes</td>
<td>13-4, 14-4, 15-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Building Safety</td>
<td>13-7, 13-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelines</td>
<td>13-11, 13-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami</td>
<td>13-1, 14-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Event Management</td>
<td>13-3, 13-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below summarizes the responses.

![Policy Implementation Survey Results](image)

The individual policy statements organized by categories, survey questions (in italics) and breakdown of responses follow. Note that the total number of responses in the list will total 22 while the number in the graph will be 18. The data has been edited to give one response per state as explained above.
Risk Reduction Strategies


WSSPC strongly encourages states and local governments to form public-private partnerships to develop and continually update long-term, comprehensive statewide and community-level earthquake and tsunami risk-reduction strategies as part of an all-hazards plan to reduce injury, loss of life, property damage and economic disruption from earthquakes and tsunamis.

Has your agency sent this policy recommendation to all identified policy and decision makers (elected officials, heads of key departments, such as emergency managers, building officials and planners, and chairs of the State Seismic Safety Commissions and Boards)?

Yes (7): AS-EM, GU, HI, NV-GS, NV-SC, UT, WA
No (9): AK, AS-EM, BC, CA-GS, CO-GS, ID, MT, OR, WY
N/A (1): CO-SC
Blank (5): AZ, CA-EM, MP, NM, YT

15-2

Yes, 6
No, 8
Blank, 4
N/A, 0
Hazard Identification and Assessment

Policy Recommendation 15-1: Earthquake and Tsunami Planning Scenarios
WSSPC recommends that each member state, province, and territory establish an active program to produce Earthquake and/or Tsunami Planning Scenarios for areas with high risk and vulnerability. WSSPC also recommends that state and federal agencies and potential private partners support the production of these Planning Scenarios through their funding resources and in-kind services.

Has your agency developed and published any new earthquake planning scenarios since 2012?

No (5): AS-EM, CO-SC, GU, OR, WY
N/A (0)
Blank (4): AZ, NM, MP, YT
Hazard Identification and Assessment

Policy Recommendation 15-3: Definitions of Recency of Surface Faulting for the Basin and Range Province

WSSPC recommends that each state in the Basin and Range physiographic province (BRP), through consultation with state and federal geological surveys and other earthquake-hazard experts, define scientifically and societally relevant categories for recency of surface faulting (generally earthquake magnitude $\geq M 6.5$).

Examples of categories that are applicable for much of the BRP include the following:
- Latest Pleistocene-Holocene fault – a fault whose movement in the past 15 ka has been large enough to break the ground surface.
- Late Quaternary fault – a fault whose movement in the past 130 ka has been large enough to break the ground surface.
- Quaternary fault – a fault whose movement in the past 2.6 Ma (Cohen and Gibbard, 2010) has been large enough to break the ground surface.

WSSPC further recommends that in the absence of information to the contrary, all Quaternary faults be considered Latest Pleistocene-Holocene active unless there are adequate data to confidently assign them to a Late Quaternary or Quaternary activity class.

Have these definitions of surface faulting in the Basin & Range Province been communicated to policy makers?

**Yes (5):** CA-GS, ID, NV-GS, NV-SC, UT  
**No (5):** BC, CO-SC, MT, OR, WY  
**N/A (8):** AK, AS-EM (2), CA-EM, CO-GS, GU, HI, WA  
**Blank (4):** AZ, NM, MP, YT
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15-3
Earthquake Monitoring and Early Warning

Policy Recommendation 14-3: Earthquake Monitoring Networks
WSSPC advocates the continuation and expansion of earthquake monitoring networks as envisioned and supported by the Advanced National Seismic System (ANSS). ANSS emphasizes expanded strong-motion instrumentation in urban areas, including selected engineered structures, as well as increased regional broadband seismograph instrumentation. The resulting data will provide better understanding of future ground shaking potential, more rapid information for emergency response, and insights for the improved design of more earthquake-resistant new and retrofitted construction.

WSSPC calls upon all parties committed to earthquake loss reduction to advocate greater support of the U.S. Geological Survey’s efforts to expand ANSS monitoring and to standardize data collection, processing, and storage. In addition, WSSPC calls upon USGS to prioritize operation and maintenance of the ANSS networks to comply with the USGS performance metrics. To further these efforts, WSSPC encourages strengthening partnerships among the USGS, State, and local public and private entities, as well as with emergency managers, engineers, and corporate response and business interruption planners.

Has your state, province, or territory been able to expand its seismic monitoring capabilities in partnership with the USGS or Geological Survey of Canada?

Yes (10): AK, BC, CA-EM, CA-GS, CO-GS, CO-SC, NV-GS, OR, UT, WA
No (7): AS-EM, GU, HI, ID, MT, NV-SC, WY
N/A (1): AS-EM
Blank (4): AZ, NM, MP, YT

[Diagram showing the results: Yes, 8; No, 6; Blank, 4; N/A, 0]
Earthquake Monitoring and Early Warning

Policy Recommendation 14-7: *Earthquake Early Warning Systems*
WSSPC supports the research, development, and implementation of earthquake early warning systems in those states or regions with high seismic risk and a seismic network that can, or can be enhanced to, support an early warning capability.

*Has your state, province, or territory established a state level working group on earthquake early warning?*

**Yes (5):** AS-EM, BC, CA-EM, CA-GS, GU  
**No (11):** AK, CO-GS, CO-SC, HI, ID, MT, NV-GS, NV-SC, OR, UT, WY  
**N/A (1):** AS-EM  
**Blank (5):** AZ, NM, MP, WA, YT
Building Codes

Policy Recommendation 15-4: Identification and Mitigation of Non-Ductile Concrete Buildings
WSSPC recommends that states, provinces, territories or communities with moderate and high seismicity consider creating programs to identify non-ductile concrete buildings and develop plans and policies that will effectively reduce the risks in their jurisdictions.

Has your state, province or territory identified, prioritized, or inventoried its non-ductile concrete buildings?

Yes (2): CA-EM, CA-GS
N/A (1): AS-EM
Blank (4): AZ, NM, MP, YT
Building Codes

Policy Recommendation 14-4: Identification and Mitigation of Unreinforced Masonry Structures

Unreinforced masonry bearing-wall structures represent one of the greatest life-safety threats and economic burdens to the public during damaging earthquakes. WSSPC recommends that each state, province or territory adopt a program to identify the extent of risk that unreinforced masonry structures represent in their communities and develop recommendations that will effectively address the reduction of this risk.

Has your state, province, or territory adopted a program to identify the risk from unreinforced masonry buildings?

Yes (5): CA-EM, CA-GS, ID, NV-GS, NV-SC
No (12): AK, AS-EM, BC, CO-GS, CO-SC, GU, HI, MT, OR, UT, WA, WY
N/A (1): AS-EM
Blank (4): AZ, NM, MP, YT
Building Codes

WSSPC endorses the prompt adoption and enforcement of the seismic provisions of the 2012 *International Existing Building Code*, the 2012 *International Building Code*, and the 2012 *International Residential Code* as minimum standards by states, territories, provinces and/or local jurisdictions. Further, WSSPC discourages modifications or amendments that would weaken the Code or its required inspections. WSSPC also encourages Code organizations to continue the development and refinement of building codes and consensus standards to remain substantially equivalent to the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) Recommended Seismic Provisions for New Buildings and Other Structures (FEMA 750) with a specific focus on purpose, education, incentives, lifelines and the business/industry and homeowner sectors.

*Has your state, province, or territory adopted seismic provisions that meet or exceed those provisions in the 2012 International Building Code?*

**Yes (9):** CA-EM, CA-GS, CO-GS, ID, NV-GS, NV-SC, OR, UT, WA  
**No (7):** AK, AS-EM, BC, CO-SC, GU, HI, WY  
**N/A (1):** AS-EM  
**Blank (5):** AZ, MT, NM, MP, YT
School Building Safety

The Western States Seismic Policy Council, with the support of the Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, recommends that each member state, province and territory establish as a goal that all school buildings be seismically resilient. This recommendation that seismically vulnerable school buildings be retrofitted or replaced by new earthquake resilient school buildings is an important part of a nationwide school earthquake resiliency goal.

Has the policy recommendation been distributed to policy and decision makers, elected officials, school districts, parent/teacher associations, teacher unions, school administrators, building departments or elected leaders?

Yes (5): AK, CA-EM, CO-GS, GU, NV-SC
No (9): AS-EM, CA-GS, CO-SC, HI, ID, NV-GS, OR, UT, WY
N/A (2): AS-EM, BC
Blank (6): AZ, MT, NM, MP, WA, YT
School Building Safety

Policy Recommendation 13-7: Seismic Design of New Schools
WSSPC recommends that each member state, province, and territory establish and fund an active program to improve the seismic safety of new schools and ensure that seismic building code provisions for new schools are followed. WSSPC also recommends that appropriate responsible local, state, and federal entities provide dedicated financial support for the establishment of a program that improves the seismic safety of new schools.

Has the policy recommendation been sent to all identified policy and decision makers, (elected officials), heads of key departments such as emergency managers, building officials and planners and chairs of State Seismic Safety Commissions and Boards?

Yes (7): AK, CA-EM, CO-GS, GU, NV-GS, NV-SC, WA
No (9): AS-EM, BC, CA-GS, CO-SC, HI, ID, OR, UT, WY
N/A (1): AS-EM
Blank (5): AZ, MT, NM, MP, YT
Lifelines

Policy Recommendation 13-11: Reliability of Lifeline Infrastructure
WSSPC encourages improving the reliability and survivability of lifeline infrastructure and hereby supports the development of seismic design and performance guidelines for both new and existing infrastructure.

Has your state, province, or territory encouraged the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) or other stakeholders to develop guidelines addressing the seismic resilience of critical infrastructure?

Yes (6): BC, CA-EM, CA-GS, NV-SC, UT, WA
No (10): AK, AS-EM, CO-GS, CO-SC, GU, HI, ID, NV-GS, OR, WY
N/A (1): AS-EM
Blank (5): AZ, MT, NM, MP, YT
Lifelines

Policy Recommendation 13-12: Earthquake Actuated Automatic Gas Shutoff Devices
WSSPC recommends that each state, province or territory which is considering implementing requirements for installing automatic gas shutoff devices in industrial, commercial and/or residential applications assure that shutoff valves meet the provisions of the most currently available revision of ANSI/ASCE/SEI Standard 25 (Earthquake-Actuated Automatic Gas Shutoff Devices) and be installed in conformance with the manufacturer’s installation instructions. The cost versus benefit of turning gas on after an event or the analysis of false activation is left to the jurisdiction. The policy only advocates that if a decision is made to proceed with earthquake actuated automatic gas shutoff devices that the current state-of-the-art provisions be utilized.

Has your state, province, or territory considered implementing requirements for installing automatic gas shutoff devices in industrial, commercial and/or residential applications that meet the provisions of the most currently available revision of ANSI/ASCE/SEI Standard 25 (Earthquake-Actuated Automatic Gas Shutoff Devices)?

Yes (4): CA-EM, CA-GS, MT, NV-GS
N/A (3): AK, AS-EM, GU
Blank (4): AZ, NM, MP, YT
Tsunami

Policy Recommendation 14-1: Improving Tsunami Public Education, Mitigation, and Warning Procedures for Distant and Local Sources

WSSPC recommends expanding the efforts by NOAA, the USGS, FEMA, and WSSPC members to enhance public education programs about the potential for impacts from local tsunamis and the need to evacuate threatened areas immediately after strong or sustained ground shaking; giving prioritization to these efforts, which have an immediate and direct impact on life-safety for local tsunamis, over deep-sea tsunami detection systems that have no benefit for local warnings. WSSPC also recommends robust, effective, and fully maintained implementation of the tsunami detection system by NOAA, as long as it is not at the expense of community-level tsunami preparedness, mitigation, and recovery planning.

Has your state, province, or territory communicated to federal, state, and local stakeholders its position on support for increased mitigation, preparedness, and response efforts in communities at risk to local tsunami sources?

Yes (10): AK, AS-EM (2), BC, CA-EM, CA-GS, GU, HI, OR, WA
No (2): NV-GS, UT
N/A (6): CO-GS, CO-SC, ID, MT, NV-SC, WY
Blank (6): AZ, NM, MP, YT

14-1

Legend:
- Yes, 8
- No, 2
- N/A, 4
- Blank, 4
Tsunami

Policy Recommendation 13-1: *Rapid Tsunami Identification and Evacuation Notification*

WSSPC recommends that each coastal state, province, and territory emergency management agency work with coastal jurisdictions to develop evacuation plans for both local- and distant-source tsunamis, which have in place evacuation and re-entry notification systems, and supplement these emergency plans with a preparedness education campaign focusing on instructions to evacuate based on ground shaking, that ensures all populated coastal areas in the WSSPC coastal states, territories and provinces are guided by at least one type of system, appropriate to local conditions.

(a) Has your state, province, or territory shared Policy Recommendation 13-1 with your legislative delegations encouraging the development of rapid, multiple tsunami notification systems and support for tsunami education and awareness activities?

Yes (6): AS-EM (2), CA-GS, GU-EM, HI-EM, WA-all  
No (5): BC-EM, CA-EM, NV-GS, OR-EM, UT-all  
N/A (7): AK-all, CO-GS, CO-SC, ID-all, MT-GS, NV-SC, WY-GS  
Blank (4): AZ, NM, MP, YT
(b) Has your state, province or territory worked with NTHMP to support development of guidance on rapid identification and notification systems?

**Yes (8):** AS-EM (2), BC, CA-EM, CA-GS, GU, HI, WA,
**No (4):** NV-GS, NV-SC, OR, UT
**N/A (6):** AK, CO-GS, CO-SC, ID, MT, WY
**Blank (4):** AZ, NM, MP, YT

---

(c) Has your state, province, or territory forwarded Policy Recommendation 13-1 to NOAA, USGS, FEMA, or other organizations for budgetary and technical support?

**Yes (7):** AS-EM (2), CA-EM, CA-GS, GU, HI, WA
**No (4):** NV-GS, NV-SC, OR, UT
**N/A (7):** AK, BC, CO-GS, CO-SC, ID, MT, WY
**Blank (4):** AZ, NM, MP, YT
Post-Event Management

Policy Recommendation 13-3: *Post-Earthquake Technical Clearinghouses*
WSSPC recommends that each member state, province, and territory establish a plan for a post-earthquake technical clearinghouse to be activated if possible within 24 hours after each major earthquake within its jurisdiction. WSSPC also recommends that multijurisdictional agreements between and among WSSPC members and Federal agencies be in place that would allow for the establishment of a single comprehensive technical clearinghouse in the event of a large earthquake.

(a) Has your state, province, or territory established a plan for a post-earthquake clearinghouse?

**Yes (4):** CA-EM, CA-GS, UT, WA  
**No (13):** AK, AS-EM, BC, CO-GS, CO-SC, GU, HI, ID, MT, NV-GS, NV-SC, OR, WY  
**N/A (1):** AS-EM  
**Blank (4):** AZ, NM, MP, YT

![13-3 (a) Pie Chart](image-url)
(b) Has your state, province, or territory established MOA’s with NEHRP agencies or others?

Yes (4): CA-GS, CO-SC, NV-GS, UT
No (11): AS-EM, BC, CO-GS, GU, HI, ID, MT, NV-SC, OR, WA, WY
N/A (2): AS-EM, CA-EM
Blank (5): AK, AZ, NM, MP, YT
Post-Event Management

Policy Recommendation 13-6: Post-Earthquake Information Management System
WSSPC supports the development of a national Post-Earthquake Information Management System. The Management System would provide permanent archiving of essential data related to natural and socio-economic earthquake effects and the performance of the built environment from earthquakes within the United States, and could be combined with similar data systems that assemble and archive data from other natural hazards events, or geosciences data repositories that archive physical and electronic data.

(a) Has your state, province, or territory communicated support to NEHRP agencies (or others) for the establishment of a national Post-Earthquake Information Management System?

Yes (6): CA-EM, CA-GS, CO-GS, NV-SC, UT, WA
No (9): AK, AS-EM, CO-SC, GU, HI, ID, MT, OR, WY
N/A (3): AS-EM, BC, NV-GS
Blank (4): AZ, NM, MP, YT

13-6 (a)
(b) Has your state, province, or territory provided written support for the establishment of a pilot or demonstration Post-Earthquake Information Management System?

Yes (3): CA-EM, CA-GS, UT
N/A (1): AS-EM
Blank (5): AK, AZ, NM, MP, YT

![13-6 (b) diagram]

(c) Has your state, province, or territory established one or more local or regional partnerships and agreements for the purpose of assuring the collection of post-earthquake performance and damage information for long-term use?

Yes (5): CA-EM, CA-GS, HI-EM, NV-SC, UT-all
N/A (2): AS-EM, NV-GS
Blank (5): AK, AZ, NM, MP, YT

![13-6 (c) diagram]