Appendix F   - Depth Damage Curves

TABLE 1.
Residential, One Story with Basement.

Structure			Content		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage	Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8	0%	0	-8	0.10%	1.6
-7	0.70%	1.34	-7	0.80%	1.16
-6	0.80%	1.06	-6	2.10%	0.92
-5	2.40%	0.94	-5	3.70%	0.81
-4	5.20%	0.91	-4	5.70%	0.78
-3	9.00%	0.88	-3	8.00%	0.76
-2	13.80%	0.85	-2	10.50%	0.74
-1	19.40%	0.83	-1	13.20%	0.72
0	25.50%	0.85	0	16.00%	0.74
1	32.00%	0.96	1	18.90%	0.83
2	38.70%	1.14	2	21.80%	0.98
3	45.50%	1.37	3	24.70%	1.17
4	52.20%	1.63	4	27.40%	1.39
5	58.60%	1.89	5	30.00%	1.6
6	64.50%	2.14	6	32.40%	1.81
7	69.80%	2.35	7	34.50%	1.99
8	74.20%	2.52	8	36.30%	2.13
9	77.70%	2.66	9	37.70%	2.25
10	80.10%	2.77	10	38.60%	2.35
11	81.10%	2.88	11	39.10%	2.45
12	81.10%	2.88	12	39.10%	2.45
13	81.10%	2.88	13	39.10%	2.45
14	81.10%	2.88	14	39.10%	2.45
15	81.10%	2.88	15	39.10%	2.45

TABLE 1.
Residential, One Story with Basement.

Structure			Content		
16	81.10%	2.88	16	39.10%	2.45

TABLE 2.
Residential, Two or More Stories, With Basement

	Structure			Content	
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage	Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8	1.70%	2.7	-8	0%	0
-7	1.70%	2.7	-7	1.00%	2.27
-6	1.90%	2.11	-6	2.30%	1.76
-5	2.90%	1.8	-5	3.70%	1.49
-4	4.70%	1.66	-4	5.20%	1.37
-3	7.20%	1.56	-3	6.80%	1.29
-2	10.20%	1.47	-2	8.40%	1.21
-1	13.90%	1.37	-1	10.10%	1.13
0	17.90%	1.32	0	11.90%	1.09
1	22.30%	1.35	1	13.80%	1.11
2	27.00%	1.5	2	15.70%	1.23
3	31.90%	1.75	3	17.70%	1.43
4	36.90%	2.04	4	19.80%	1.67
5	41.90%	2.34	5	22.00%	1.92
6	46.90%	2.63	6	24.30%	2.15
7	51.80%	2.89	7	26.70%	2.36
8	56.40%	3.13	8	29.10%	2.56
9	60.80%	3.38	9	31.70%	2.76
10	64.80%	3.71	10	34.40%	3.04
11	68.40%	4.22	11	37.20%	3.46
12	71.40%	5.02	12	40.00%	4.12
13	73.70%	6.19	13	43.00%	5.08
14	75.40%	7.79	14	46.10%	6.39
15	76.40%	9.84	15	49.30%	8.08
16	76.40%	12.36	16	52.60%	10.15

TABLE 3.
Residential, Split Level, With Basement

	Structure			Content	
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage	Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8			-8	0.60%	2.09
-7			-7	0.70%	1.49
-6	2.50%	1.80%	-6	1.40%	1.14
-5	3.10%	1.60%	-5	2.40%	1.01
-4	4.70%	1.50%	-4	3.80%	1
-3	7.20%	1.60%	-3	5.40%	1.02
-2	10.40%	1.60%	-2	7.30%	1.03
-1	14.20%	1.60%	-1	9.40%	1.04
0	18.50%	1.60%	0	11.60%	1.06
1	23.20%	1.70%	1	13.80%	1.12
2	28.20%	1.90%	2	16.10%	1.23
3	33.40%	2.10%	3	18.20%	1.38
4	38.60%	2.40%	4	20.20%	1.57
5	43.80%	2.60%	5	22.10%	1.76
6	48.80%	2.90%	6	23.60%	1.95
7	53.50%	3.20%	7	24.90%	2.13
8	57.80%	3.40%	8	25.80%	2.28
9	61.60%	3.60%	9	26.30%	2.44
10	64.80%	3.90%	10	26.30%	2.44
11	67.20%	4.20%	11	26.30%	2.44
12	68.80%	4.80%	12	26.30%	2.44
13	69.30%	5.70%	13	26.30%	2.44
14	69.30%	5.70%	14	26.30%	2.44
15	69.30%	5.70%	15	26.30%	2.44
16	69.30%	5.70%	16	26.30%	2.44

TABLE 4.
Residential, One Story, No Basement

	Structure			Content	
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage	Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-2	0%	0%	-2	0%	0%
-1	2.50%	2.70%	-1	2.40%	2.10%
0	13.40%	2.00%	0	8.10%	1.50%
1	23.30%	1.60%	1	13.30%	1.20%
2	32.10%	1.60%	2	17.90%	1.20%
3	40.10%	1.80%	3	22.00%	1.40%
4	47.10%	1.90%	4	25.70%	1.50%
5	53.20%	2.00%	5	28.80%	1.60%
6	58.60%	2.10%	6	31.50%	1.60%
7	63.20%	2.20%	7	33.80%	1.70%
8	67.20%	2.30%	8	35.70%	1.80%
9	70.50%	2.40%	9	37.20%	1.90%
10	73.20%	2.70%	10	38.40%	2.10%
11	75.40%	3.00%	11	39.20%	2.30%
12	77.20%	3.30%	12	39.70%	2.60%
13	78.50%	3.70%	13	40.00%	2.90%
14	79.50%	4.10%	14	40.00%	3.20%
15	80.20%	4.50%	15	40.00%	3.50%
16	80.70%	4.90%	16	40.00%	3.80%

TABLE 5.
Residential, Two of More Stories, No Basement

	Structure			Content	
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage	Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-2	0%	0%	-2	0%	0%
-1	3.00%	4.10%	-1	1.00%	3.50%
0	9.30%	3.40%	0	5.00%	2.90%
1	15.20%	3.00%	1	8.70%	2.60%
2	20.90%	2.80%	2	12.20%	2.50%
3	26.30%	2.90%	3	15.50%	2.50%
4	31.40%	3.20%	4	18.50%	2.70%
5	36.20%	3.40%	5	21.30%	3.00%
6	40.70%	3.70%	6	23.90%	3.20%
7	44.90%	3.90%	7	26.30%	3.30%
8	48.80%	4.00%	8	28.40%	3.40%
9	52.40%	4.10%	9	30.30%	3.50%
10	55.70%	4.20%	10	32.00%	3.50%
11	58.70%	4.20%	11	33.40%	3.50%
12	61.40%	4.20%	12	34.70%	3.50%
13	63.80%	4.20%	13	35.60%	3.50%
14	65.90%	4.30%	14	36.40%	3.60%
15	67.70%	4.60%	15	36.90%	3.80%
16	69.20%	5.00%	16	37.20%	4.20%

TABLE 6.
Residential, Split Level, No basement

	Structure			Content	
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage	Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-2	0%	0%	-2	0%	0%
-1	6.40%	2.90%	-1	2.20%	2.20%
0	7.20%	2.10%	0	2.90%	1.50%
1	9.40%	1.90%	1	4.70%	1.20%
2	12.90%	1.90%	2	7.50%	1.30%
3	17.40%	2.00%	3	11.10%	1.40%
4	22.80%	2.20%	4	15.30%	1.50%
5	28.90%	2.40%	5	20.10%	1.60%
6	35.50%	2.70%	6	25.20%	1.80%
7	42.30%	3.20%	7	30.50%	2.10%
8	49.20%	3.80%	8	35.70%	2.50%
9	56.10%	4.50%	9	40.90%	3.00%
10	62.60%	5.30%	10	45.80%	3.50%
11	68.60%	6.00%	11	50.20%	4.10%
12	73.90%	6.70%	12	54.10%	4.60%
13	78.40%	7.40%	13	57.20%	5.00%
14	81.70%	7.90%	14	59.40%	5.40%
15	83.80%	8.30%	15	60.50%	5.70%
16	84.40%	8.70%	16	60.50%	6.00%

TABLE 7.

Non-residential, Commercial and Industry

	Structure		Contents
Depth	Combined Commercial Industrial	Depth	Combined Commercial Industrial
-8		-8	
-7		-7	
-6		-6	
-5		-5	
-4	0.00%	-4	0.00%
-3	0.00%	-3	0.00%
-2	0.00%	-2	0.00%
-1	0.00%	-1	0.00%
0	0.68%	0	2.75%
1	10.21%	1	19.50%
2	14.21%	2	33.73%
3	17.46%	3	45.16%
4	20.92%	4	55.26%
5	24.02%	5	62.08%
6	27.35%	6	66.93%
7	30.50%	7	70.34%
8	33.72%	8	73.19%
9	36.89%	9	75.46%
10	39.86%	10	77.21%
11	43.52%	11	79.60%
12	46.85%	12	81.10%
13	49.45%	13	82.40%
14	51.85%	14	83.64%
15	54.31%	15	84.28%
16	56.53%	16	84.82%

Note: This curve was created by USACE, Galveston District

References:

Economic Guidance Memorandum (EGM) 04-01, Generic Depth-Damage Relationships for Residential Structures with Basements.

United States Army Corp of Engineers, Galveston District, HAZUS application.

CECW-PG   10 October 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Economic Guidance Memorandum (EGM) 04-01, Generic Depth-Damage
Relationships for Residential Structures with Basements.

1. Purpose. The purpose of this memorandum is to release, and provide guidance for the
use of, generic depth-damage curves for use in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers flood
damage reduction studies.

2. Background. Proper planning and evaluation of flood damage reduction projects
require knowledge of actual damage caused to various types of properties. The primary
purpose of the Flood Damage Data Collection Program is to meet that requirement by
providing Corps district offices with standardized relationships for estimating flood
damage and other costs of flooding, based on actual losses from flood events. Under this
program, data have been collected from major flooding that occurred in various parts of
the United States from 1996 through 2001. Damage data collected are based on
comprehensive accounting of losses from flood victims' records. The generic functions
developed and provided in this EGM represent a substantive improvement over other
generalized depth-damage functions such as the Flood Insurance Administration (FIA)
Rate Reviews.

3. Results. Generic damage functions are attached for one-story homes with basement,
two or more story homes with basement, and split-level homes with basement. Generic
damage functions for similar structures without basements were published in 2000 and
are included as enclosure 1 for ready reference.

        a. Regression analysis was used to create the damage functions. While several
independent variables, such as flood duration and flood warning lead-time, were
examined in building the models, the models that were most efficient in explaining the
percent damage to structure and contents were quadratic and cubic forms with depth as
the only independent variable.

        b. Content damage was modeled with the dependent variable being content
damage as a percentage of structure value. This differs from the previous technique of
first developing content valuations and then content damage relationships as a function of
content valuations. The generic content damage models are statistically significant and
their use eliminates the need to establish content-to-structure ratios through surveys.

        c. While the data collected include information on all aspects of National
Economic Development (NED) losses, only results and recommendations related to the
structure and content damages for homes with basements are included in this EGM.

CECW-PG
SUBJECT: Economic Guidance Memorandum (EGM) 04-01, Generic Depth-Damage Relationships

   Direct costs for cleanup expenses, unpaid hours for cleanup and repair, emergency damage prevention actions, and other flood-related costs are not included in these damage functions. Information on other residential flood costs, beyond those included in these damage functions will found the summary report, discussed in paragraph 5. These costs should be developed using site-specific historical information.

4. Application. The following paragraphs provide information on the application of the generic curves within the HEC-FDA damage calculation program.

        a. The economic section of HEC-FDA divides the quantification of flood damages into a direct method and an indirect method. The direct method allows the user to directly enter a stage-damage relationship for any structure. This approach is commonly used for large or unique properties such as industrial or pubic buildings. The indirect method quantifies the stage-damage relationship for a group of structures that have significant commonality. Typically damage to residential structures is calculated using the indirect method. The procedures described in the following paragraphs apply only when using the indirect method to determine the stage-damage relationship.

        b. The traditional approach to quantifying damage to contents by the indirect method relies on three pieces of information: 1) structure value; 2) content-to-structure value ratio; and 3) the content depth-damage relationship. The content-to-structure value ratio and content depth-damage relationship are unique to the structure occupancy type to which a structure is assigned. The content depth-damage relationship provides the estimate of content flood damage as a percentage of content value. Thus, to calculate a content stage-damage function for an individual structure, the structure value for an individual structure is first multiplied by the content-to-structure value ratio to provide an estimate of the content value. This content value is then multiplied by each percent damage value of the content depth-damage relationship.

        c. The new content depth-damage functions provided herein are different from those used by the Corps in the past in one important aspect. The new functions calculate content damage as a percent of structure value rather than content value. Using these functions within HEC-FDA requires care in specifying a content-to-structure value ratio. To understand the requirements for using the new content depth-damage functions requires a basic understanding of how HEC-FDA calculates content damage.

        (1). To calculate damages by the indirect method, each structure must be assigned to a structure occupancy type. For each structure occupancy type a content-to-structure value ratio and content depth-damage relationship are defined. These data for calculating content damage within HEC-FDA is entered on the "Study Structure Occupancy Type" screen. As long as a content value is not entered for a structure in the Structure Inventory Data, HEC-FDA calculates the content stage-damage by first calculating content using the structure value multiplied by the content-to-structure value ratio.

In some instances, however, analysts develop unique estimates of content values for a structure, which are entered for the individual structure on the Structure Inventory Data screen. For each structure that has a content value entered, calculating a content value by using the content-to-structure value ratio is ignored and the user entered content value is used to calculate content damage.

(2). The new content depth-damage functions do not require this intermediate step of calculating content values. Therefore, the content-to-structure value ratio for each structure occupancy type using the new content depth-damage relationships must be set to one hundred percent (100). This forces the content depth-damage function to be multiplied by the structure value as required. Also, the "Error Associated with Content/Structure Value" on the "Study Structure Occupancy Type" screen should be left blank. This implies that the error in content-to-structure value ratio is part of the new content depth-damage relationship.

(3). Because entering a content value on the Structure Inventory Data window overrides the content-to-structure value ratio, the new content depth-damage relationships should not be used for structures that have separately entered content values.

(4). Questions concerning the use of the generic curves within the HEC-FDA model can be addressed to Dr. David Moser, Institute of Water Resources (IWR), (703) 428-8066.

5. Report. A report summarizing the data collection effort and analyses performed to derive these curves will shortly be available on the IWR website. More information may be obtained by contacting the program's principal investigator, Stuart Davis, (703) 428-7086.

6. Waiver to Policy. These curves are developed for nation-wide applicability in flood damage reduction studies. When using these curves, the requirement to develop site-specific depth-damage curves contained in ER 1105-2-100, E-19q.(2) is waived. Additionally, the requirement to develop content valuations and content-to-structure ratios based on site-specific or comparable floodplain information, ER 1005-2-100, E-19q.(1)(a), is also waived. Note these waivers currently apply only to single-family homes with and without basements for which generic curves have been published, and not other categories of flood inundation damages for which no generic curves exist. Feasibility reports must state the generic curves are being used in the flood damage analysis for residential structures with and/or without basements. Use of these curves is optional and analysts should always endeavor to use the best available information to accurately quantify the damages and benefits in inundation reduction studies.

CECW-PG
SUBJECT: Economic Guidance Memorandum (EGM) 04-01, Generic Depth-Damage
Relationships

7. <u>Point of Contact</u>. Administrators of the Flood Damage Data Collection Program
continue to collect and analyze flood-related damages to both residential and commercial
properties. The HQUSACE program monitor is Lillian Almodovar, (202) 761-4233, who
can address any questions concerning the program.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

                                    /s/
Encl   WILLIAM R. DAWSON, P.E.
                                    Chief, Planning and Policy Division
                                    Directorate of Civil Works

CECW-PG
SUBJECT: Economic Guidance Memorandum (EGM) 04-01, Generic Depth-Damage
Relationships

DISTRIBUTION:
North Atlantic Division, ATTN: CENAD-ET-P
South Atlantic Division, ATTN: CESAD-ET-P
Great Lakes/Ohio River Division: ATTN: CELRD-E-P
Northwestern Division, ATTN: CENWD-PNP-ET-P
Pacific Ocean Division, ATTN: CEPOD-ET-E
South Pacific Division, ATTN: CESPD-ET-P
Southwestern Division, ATTN: CESWD-ET-P
Mississippi Valley Division: ATTN: CEMVD-PM

DAMAGE FUNCTIONS
FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
STRUCTURES WITH BASEMENTS

Structure Depth-Damage

Table 1 Structure One Story, With Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8	0%	0
-7	0.7%	1.34
-6	0.8%	1.06
-5	2.4%	0.94
-4	5.2%	0.91
-3	9.0%	0.88
-2	13.8%	0.85
-1	19.4%	0.83
0	25.5%	0.85
1	32.0%	0.96
2	38.7%	1.14
3	45.5%	1.37
4	52.2%	1.63
5	58.6%	1.89
6	64.5%	2.14
7	69.8%	2.35
8	74.2%	2.52
9	77.7%	2.66
10	80.1%	2.77
11	81.1%	2.88
12	81.1%	2.88
13	81.1%	2.88
14	81.1%	2.88
15	81.1%	2.88
16	81.1%	2.88

		Table 2 Structure Two or More Stories, With Basement	
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8	1.7%	2.70
-7	1.7%	2.70
-6	1.9%	2.11
-5	2.9%	1.80
-4	4.7%	1.66
-3	7.2%	1.56
-2	10.2%	1.47
-1	13.9%	1.37
0	17.9%	1.32
1	22.3%	1.35
2	27.0%	1.50
3	31.9%	1.75
4	36.9%	2.04
5	41.9%	2.34
6	46.9%	2.63
7	51.8%	2.89
8	56.4%	3.13
9	60.8%	3.38
10	64.8%	3.71
11	68.4%	4.22
12	71.4%	5.02
13	73.7%	6.19
14	75.4%	7.79
15	76.4%	9.84
16	76.4%	12.36

Table 3 Structure Split Level, With Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8		
-7		
-6	2.5%	1.8%
-5	3.1%	1.6%
-4	4.7%	1.5%
-3	7.2%	1.6%
-2	10.4%	1.6%
-1	14.2%	1.6%
0	18.5%	1.6%
1	23.2%	1.7%
2	28.2%	1.9%
3	33.4%	2.1%
4	38.6%	2.4%
5	43.8%	2.6%
6	48.8%	2.9%
7	53.5%	3.2%
8	57.8%	3.4%
9	61.6%	3.6%
10	64.8%	3.9%
11	67.2%	4.2%
12	68.8%	4.8%
13	69.3%	5.7%
14	69.3%	5.7%
15	69.3%	5.7%
16	69.3%	5.7%

Content Depth-Damage

Table 4 Content One Story, With Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8	0.1%	1.60
-7	0.8%	1.16
-6	2.1%	0.92
-5	3.7%	0.81
-4	5.7%	0.78
-3	8.0%	0.76
-2	10.5%	0.74
-1	13.2%	0.72
0	16.0%	0.74
1	18.9%	0.83
2	21.8%	0.98
3	24.7%	1.17
4	27.4%	1.39
5	30.0%	1.60
6	32.4%	1.81
7	34.5%	1.99
8	36.3%	2.13
9	37.7%	2.25
10	38.6%	2.35
11	39.1%	2.45
12	39.1%	2.45
13	39.1%	2.45
14	39.1%	2.45
15	39.1%	2.45
16	39.1%	2.45

Table 5		
Content		
Two or More Stories-With Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8	0%	0
-7	1.0%	2.27
-6	2.3%	1.76
-5	3.7%	1.49
-4	5.2%	1.37
-3	6.8%	1.29
-2	8.4%	1.21
-1	10.1%	1.13
0	11.9%	1.09
1	13.8%	1.11
2	15.7%	1.23
3	17.7%	1.43
4	19.8%	1.67
5	22.0%	1.92
6	24.3%	2.15
7	26.7%	2.36
8	29.1%	2.56
9	31.7%	2.76
10	34.4%	3.04
11	37.2%	3.46
12	40.0%	4.12
13	43.0%	5.08
14	46.1%	6.39
15	49.3%	8.08
16	52.6%	10.15

Table 6 Content Split-Level-With Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-8	0.6%	2.09
-7	0.7%	1.49
-6	1.4%	1.14
-5	2.4%	1.01
-4	3.8%	1.00
-3	5.4%	1.02
-2	7.3%	1.03
-1	9.4%	1.04
0	11.6%	1.06
1	13.8%	1.12
2	16.1%	1.23
3	18.2%	1.38
4	20.2%	1.57
5	22.1%	1.76
6	23.6%	1.95
7	24.9%	2.13
8	25.8%	2.28
9	26.3%	2.44
10	26.3%	2.44
11	26.3%	2.44
12	26.3%	2.44
13	26.3%	2.44
14	26.3%	2.44
15	26.3%	2.44
16	26.3%	2.44

ENCLOSURE
DAMAGE FUNCTIONS
FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

STRUCTURES WITHOUT BASEMENTS

Structure One Story, No Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-2	0%	0%
-1	2.5%	2.7%
0	13.4%	2.0%
1	23.3%	1.6%
2	32.1%	1.6%
3	40.1%	1.8%
4	47.1%	1.9%
5	53.2%	2.0%
6	58.6%	2.1%
7	63.2%	2.2%
8	67.2%	2.3%
9	70.5%	2.4%
10	73.2%	2.7%
11	75.4%	3.0%
12	77.2%	3.3%
13	78.5%	3.7%
14	79.5%	4.1%
15	80.2%	4.5%
16	80.7%	4.9%

Structure Two or More Stories-No Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-2	0%	0%
-1	3.0%	4.1%
0	9.3%	3.4%
1	15.2%	3.0%
2	20.9%	2.8%
3	26.3%	2.9%
4	31.4%	3.2%
5	36.2%	3.4%
6	40.7%	3.7%
7	44.9%	3.9%
8	48.8%	4.0%
9	52.4%	4.1%
10	55.7%	4.2%
11	58.7%	4.2%
12	61.4%	4.2%
13	63.8%	4.2%
14	65.9%	4.3%
15	67.7%	4.6%
16	69.2%	5.0%

Structure Split-Level-No Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-2	0%	0%
-1	6.4%	2.9%
0	7.2%	2.1%
1	9.4%	1.9%
2	12.9%	1.9%
3	17.4%	2.0%
4	22.8%	2.2%
5	28.9%	2.4%
6	35.5%	2.7%
7	42.3%	3.2%
8	49.2%	3.8%
9	56.1%	4.5%
10	62.6%	5.3%
11	68.6%	6.0%
12	73.9%	6.7%
13	78.4%	7.4%
14	81.7%	7.9%
15	83.8%	8.3%
16	84.4%	8.7%

Content One Story, No Basement		
Depth	Mean of Damage	Standard Deviation of Damage
-2	0%	0%
-1	2.4%	2.1%
0	8.1%	1.5%
1	13.3%	1.2%
2	17.9%	1.2%
3	22.0%	1.4%
4	25.7%	1.5%
5	28.8%	1.6%
6	31.5%	1.6%
7	33.8%	1.7%
8	35.7%	1.8%
9	37.2%	1.9%
10	38.4%	2.1%
11	39.2%	2.3%
12	39.7%	2.6%
13	40.0%	2.9%
14	40.0%	3.2%
15	40.0%	3.5%
16	40.0%	3.8%

	Content Two or More Stories-No Basement	
Depth	**Mean of Damage**	**Standard Deviation of Damage**
-2	0%	0%
-1	1.0%	3.5%
0	5.0%	2.9%
1	8.7%	2.6%
2	12.2%	2.5%
3	15.5%	2.5%
4	18.5%	2.7%
5	21.3%	3.0%
6	23.9%	3.2%
7	26.3%	3.3%
8	28.4%	3.4%
9	30.3%	3.5%
10	32.0%	3.5%
11	33.4%	3.5%
12	34.7%	3.5%
13	35.6%	3.5%
14	36.4%	3.6%
15	36.9%	3.8%
16	37.2%	4.2%

	Content Split-Level-No Basement	
Depth	**Mean of Damage**	**Standard Deviation of Damage**
-2	0%	0%
-1	2.2%	2.2%
0	2.9%	1.5%
1	4.7%	1.2%
2	7.5%	1.3%
3	11.1%	1.4%
4	15.3%	1.5%
5	20.1%	1.6%
6	25.2%	1.8%
7	30.5%	2.1%
8	35.7%	2.5%
9	40.9%	3.0%
10	45.8%	3.5%
11	50.2%	4.1%
12	54.1%	4.6%
13	57.2%	5.0%
14	59.4%	5.4%
15	60.5%	5.7%
16	60.5%	6.0%