# Resilient Building Design For Natural Disasters

Name of Author: Chetankumar Bhailalbhai Patel

Designation: Lecturer in Applied Mechanics
Name of Department: Applied Mechanics Department,
Name of organization: Government Polytechnic, Kheda, India

*Abstract:* There is a demand for resilient building designing due to the increase in natural disasters. Traditional building approaches are inadequate for these natural disasters. The purpose of resiliency building designing is to not only prevent structural loss during extreme events but also to ensure rapid recovery of functionality and reduce economic disruption and preserve human lives. The paper presents comprehensive investigation on the principle, scheme, and invention that underpin resilient structure.

Disaster-specific designing schemes include earthquakes, floods, fire resistant isolation systems, flood-elevated structures, aerodynamic building form. Smart self-healing material, Building Information Modeling (BIM)-integrated disaster simulation, and real time structural wellness monitoring are some of the technologies explored in the paper. Green substructure, renewable free energy system, and low carbon building material are seen as a key nerve pathway to a future-proof city.

The benefit and lesson learned from real-world application of resilient designing are shown in this research. Higher upfront cost, insurance policy gap, and public awareness deficit are some of the critical challenges. Performance-based codes, technological invention, and community of interests-driven preparation reinforcement resiliency as an embedded rule of building designing. Future direction suggests a growing function for artificial intelligence service, adaptive material and urban resiliency model in shaping disaster resiliency.

***keywords* - Resilient building design, Natural disaster resilience, Earthquake-resistant structures, Flood-proof construction, Hurricane resilience, Wildfire-resistant materials, Smart construction materials, Structural health monitoring, Sustainable resilient buildings, Adaptive architecture, green infrastructure, Disaster risk reduction**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Climate alteration has made the exposure of the built environment to natural disasters a concern around the Earth. Economic losses from disaster are increasing at a faster charge per unit than global GDP a, signaling the demand for proactive schemes in substructure evolution [1]. Traditional building design that focusses on compressive strength, refuge margin, and conformity with minimum regulatory code often fall short in ensuring rapid convalescence and functional persistence after a disaster

The power to recover quickly from harm is one of the - of resiliency building designing [3]. It represents paradigm shift from a "fail-safe" design to a "safe-to-fail" attack [4]. Structural system for earthquake, aerodynamic structure for hurricane, lift technique for inundation extenuation, and firing-resilient material for wildfire-prone region are critical components of resilient designing [5].

Building Information Modeling, real time Structural Health Monitoring, and the integrating of ego-healing material have enabled interior designer and engineer to better predict vulnerability and enhance resiliency. Through green substructure, renewable free energy acceptance, and the usage of low-carbon material, there is a chance to create buildings that are socially responsible [6].

Despite the growing organic structure of inquiry and technological advancement, several challenges hinder widespread acceptance of resilient designing, including higher upfront cost, deficiency of standardized public performance-based code, and uncertainty related to evolving climatic jeopardy [7]. Holistic attack to address these challenges involves coaction between architect, engineer, urban planner, policymakers and community. The principle, technology, and scheme underpinning resilient building designing are examined.

## II. Concept Of Resilient Design

Due to the impact of natural disasters, the definition of building public performance aims needs to be changed. Technology and architectural practice used to focus on compressive strength and stability. continuity of trading operations, rapid convalescence, minimal fix cost, and saving of community of interest's function are what modern resilient designing doctrine demands [1].

Critical Functionality after a disaster is maintained by resilient buildings, which are resistant to hazardous events but also resistant to hazardous events. Preserving living and avoiding disruption is what they embody [2]. The conception of resiliency integrates technological invention, sustainable building principle, and public performance-based technology to achieve buildings that are robust yet adaptable to evolving environmental challenges [6].

### 2.1 Definition and Core Principles of Resilient Building Design

The procedure of creating a structure capable of anticipating, absorbing, adapting, and recovering from hazardous impact with minimal intercession is known as resiliency building designing [7]. Even though it recognizes that harm may happen during extreme events, it emphasizes systems that can limit consequences.

The pillar of resilient designing was created by Bruneau et al. [3], include:

- It is possible to survive hazardous forces.
- In instances of constituent losers multiple, independent systems are needed to provide backup reinforcement.
- resources can be used for timely designation of problems and effective deployment of solutions during emergencies.
- Capability to recover functionality within acceptable periods post-event.

By the clip it takes to get operational normalcy back, resiliency is measured [3].

### 2.2 Difference Between Strength and Resilience

While structural compressive strength focuses on resisting applied tons up to the loser threshold, resiliency is broader, covering the scheme's power to absorb, sustain, and restore critical function quickly [5].

Even if the span survived an earthquake, it would need a calendar month of repair. If a resilient design was used, the span would remain operational [8].

Thus, strength is a necessary but insufficient condition for resilience. Ductility, controlled harm mechanism, free energy profligacy device, and strategic sacrificial component are some of the components that make resiliency possible [9].

**Table 1: Strength and Resilience Design**

| Aspect | Strength-Based Design | Resilient Design |
|---|---|---|
| Primary Goal | Avoid collapse under expected loads | Ensure continued operation post-event |
| Focus | Maximum strength | Flexibility, redundancy, adaptability |
| Failure Mode | Sudden collapse | Gradual degradation, serviceability retained |
| Recovery Time | Often long | Designed for rapid recovery |

### 2.3 Components of a Resilient Building System

Creating a resilient building requires integrating resiliency into all parts of the scheme.

#### 2.3.1 Structural Resilience

Structural resiliency is the designing of buildings that can accommodate inelastic behaviour [10]. Strategies include:

- Seismic base isolation [11]
- Energy-dissipating devices (e.g., tuned mass dampers, viscous dampers)
- Controlled rocking frames for seismic resilience

### 2.3.2 Material Resilience

Building resiliency has been improved by several solutions.

- Self-healing concrete with encapsulated bacteria makes it crack free [12].
- Fiber-reinforced composites that increase ductility and energy absorption
- Non-combustible materials such as fiber cement boards for wildfire-prone areas

### 2.3.3 Operational Resilience

Beyond physical robustness, resilient buildings require critical system redundancies:

- Emergency power supplies (solar with battery backup)
- Redundant water and communication systems
- Passive heating/cooling to maintain habitable conditions during outages [13]

### 2.4 Performance-Based Design Approach

Public performance-Based Design moves away from codification conformity to achieve explicit functional aim after a jeopardy case [14]. engineers don't design a construction solely to meet compressive strength standards.

- Immediate Occupancy (no downtime)
- Life Safety (protect occupants)
- Collapse Prevention (ultimate failure threshold)

Even though earthquake resiliency concepts such as ATC-58 and FEMA 356 are still in usage, multi-hazard PBD models are being developed to address flood, hurricane and wildfire [15].

FEMA allows buildings to be categorized based on harm and downtime after a disaster.

- Critical facilities (hospitals, emergency centers): Zero downtime
- Commercial offices: Tolerable minor damage, rapid repairs
- Residential houses should be protected from living refuge hazards even if minor structural repairs are needed.

Building use, occupancy, community function and jeopardy vulnerability determine public performance aim.

## III. Types of Natural Disasters and Resilient Strategies

The nature of the jeopardy affects the environment differently. It's important for resiliency designing to be jeopardy-specific, with a unique scheme to minimize harm, maintain living refuge, and enable rapid functional convalescence. disasters such as earthquake, flood, hurricane, and wildfire are examined in this subdivision.

### 3.1 Earthquake Resilience

Earthquakes test the flexibility of buildings. In quake-resilient structure, engineers emphasize ductility.

Installing an isolator device between a construction's base and superstructure reduces earthquakes [11]. The 1995 Kobe Earthquake showed that base of operations-isolated buildings had less harm than non-isolated buildings [16].

The life of the structural human body can be improved by using free energy profligacy devices [9]. a living refuge margin can be provided by the designing of frames.

FEMA 356 is a public performance-based designing model that guides engineers in achieving specific public performance aims, like "Immediate Occupancy" or "Collapse Prevention", depending on the building's mathematical function [17].

### 3.2 Flood Resilience

Floods can cause physical harm. Resilient design strategies prioritize elevation, floodproofing, and resilient material selection.

Elevating buildings above the BFE is the primary defense against flood. Techniques include elevating on pilings, stilts, or extended foundations [18]. Dry floodproofing and wet floodproofing are adopted based on hazard appraisal.

Structural materials that are inundation resistant include reinforced concrete, treated lumber, and closed-electric cell insularity [19].

### 3.3 Hurricane and Tornado Resilience

Hurricane, tornado, and other air current events exert forcefulness on buildings. The deprivation of the building can cause internal pressurization and catastrophic loss.

Aerodynamic building forms significantly reduce wind pressure differentials. pelvis roofs with a between 30 and 45 have been shown to perform better in hurricanes [20]. In add-on, elevating ceiling-to- **wall** connection using hurricane strap and continuous loading ensures that upheaval forces are safely transferred into the land.

The use of impact-resistant glazing protects buildings against windborne debris. Even in the most extreme weather, the integrity of the building can be maintained [21].

### 3.4 Wildfire Resilience

The danger of wildfire includes direct fire physical contact, radiant heat energy vulnerability, and airborne ember. Wildfire-resilient buildings must resist ignition for prolonged periods.

Syn-cementum railroad siding and metallic element roofing are non-combustible and reduce the exposure of structure [22]. The spreading of land fire is prevented by a flora-free geographical zone around the building.

A firing resistant landscape gardening scheme prioritizes low-inflammability plants, crushed rock buffers, and automated irrigation systems. There are shipways to reduce the strength of fire.

place during wildfire can be caused by the hazard of ember infiltrating loft and ceiling space [23].

***Table 2: Natural Disasters vs. Resilient Strategies***

| Disaster Type | Main Hazards | Resilient Strategies |
|---|---|---|
| Earthquake | Ground shaking, liquefaction | Base isolation, ductile frames, energy dissipation devices |
| Flood | Inundation, hydrostatic loads | Elevation above BFE, dry/wet floodproofing, flood-resistant materials |
| Hurricane/Tornado | High winds, flying debris | Aerodynamic forms, hurricane ties, impact-resistant glazing |
| Wildfire | Flames, radiant heat, embers | Non-combustible materials, defensible space, ember-resistant design |

## IV. Modern Technologies and Innovations for Resilient Building Design

Modern technological inventions that enhance structural public performance, enable proactive monitoring, and integrate sustainable principles are some of the things resiliency buildings designing increasingly relies on. Simulation technology, smart material and sustainable building practice are changing how resiliency is incorporated into building. There are technological tendencies that support resilience against natural disasters.

### 4.1 Smart and Self-Healing Materials

Self-healing concrete is a revolutionary invention. Concrete is prone to cracking under emphasis. Microencapsulated healing agents are incorporated into the premix that creates ego-healing concrete, which creates Ca carbonate to seal crack autonomously [12].

The religious service of structures exposed to an aggressive environment can be extended by as much as 50 percent if cracks are sealed within a few weeks [24]. Inundation prone regions, seismic zones, and coastal infrastructure are some of the topographic points where such technology is valuable. During an earthquake or strong wind, fiber-reinforced polymer and form remembering metal offer enhanced ductileness, cleft control condition, and free energy profligacy property [25].

### 4.2 Structural Health Monitoring (SHM) Systems

Proactive resilience depends on the power to detect harm before it becomes critical. Structural Health Monitoring uses a raiment of detectors [26].

An SHM-enabled building can respond to earthquakes. In the aftermath of the 1999 Chi-Chi quake in Taiwan, structure with the SHM system enabled faster harm appraisal [27]. It is possible to enhance refuge and reduce downtime by allowing targeted repair.

### 4.3 Building Information Modeling (BIM) and Disaster Simulation

Building Information Modeling is changing how resiliency is planned. Digital models of buildings can be used to model structural public performance [28].

Disaster simulation can be used to assess vulnerability early in the designing stage and program for resiliency. public performance appraisal models have been promoted by FEMA [29]. The model provides as-built certification for fix preparation and policy claims.

### 4.4 Internet of Things (IoT) and Smart Infrastructure

The integrating of the net of things into building is creating smart resilient structures that can respond to environmental jeopardy in real time. The IoT collects critical information continuously. Predicting structural vulnerability is possible with the information [30].

Automatic shuts of utility, elevator, and gaseous state lines have been implemented in Japan thanks to early admonition systems connected to building control condition systems [31]. This proactive behavior greatly reduces casualties and damages.

### 4.5 Sustainable and Low-Carbon Resilient Materials

Resilience must align with environmental responsibility. Reducing Carbon Emission and maintaining high mechanical compressive strength are some of the benefits of using geopolymer - [32].

Cross-laminated lumber, an engineered forest merchandise, is gaining popularity in sustainable building designing. Incorporating sustainable material reduces the carbon footprint.

**Table3: Modern Technologies for Resilient Design**

| Technology | Function in Resilience |
|---|---|
| Self-healing concrete | Seals cracks autonomously, improves durability |
| Fiber-reinforced polymers (FRP) | Enhances ductility, crack control, impact resistance |
| Structural Health Monitoring (SHM) | Real-time damage detection, maintenance optimization |
| Building Information Modeling (BIM) | Disaster simulations, performance-based design, faster recovery |
| Internet of Things (IoT) | Early warning, predictive maintenance, smart disaster response |

| | |
|---|---|
| Sustainable materials (e.g., geopolymer concrete, CLT) | Low-carbon resilience, fire and seismic performance |

## V. Case Studies of Resilient Building Practices

Analyzing real-universe examples of resilient building initiatives gives critical penetration into the effectiveness of designing schemes. lessons can be learned from successful instance studies.

### 5.1 Christchurch, New Zealand: Earthquake Resilience

Many older buildings were damaged in the quake. The new structure was built according to PBSD standard.

Even during the strongest daze, the infirmary was fully operational [33]. The hospital utilized:

- Lead rubber bearings for seismic isolation
- Flexible utility connections
- Redundant structural frames

These measures ensure the persistence of critical health care service after a disaster. The fixed cost for base of operations-isolated building was half the monetary value of conventional structure after the case [34]. In the rebuilding program of the metropolis, low harm designing schemes were emphasized [35].

### 5.2 New Orleans, USA: Flood and Hurricane Resilience Post-Katrina

New Orleans was exposed to hurricanes in 2005. The metropolis launched several initiatives.

The Make It Right Foundation's building was in the Lower Ninth Ward [36]. Key features of these homes included:

- Elevated foundations above flood levels
- Use of mold-resistant materials
- Renewable energy integration (solar panels with battery backups)
- Passive cooling and storm-resilient designs

New Orleans invested heavily in fortifying levees, constructing rush barriers, and implementing green substructure to absorb flood naturally [37]. The metropolis's focusing on structural and ecological resilience has resulted in reduced inundation hazard.

### 5.3 Tokyo, Japan: Seismic Resilience in High-Rise Buildings

One of the most active regions of the universe, Tokyo is a drawing card in quake resiliency high-ascent buildings. The Mori Tower is an illustration of integrated resiliency.

The tower incorporates:

- Tuned Mass Dampers (TMDs) to counteract building sway
- Dual seismic systems, combining base isolation with vibration control
- High ductility and soaking up free energy can be achieved with flexible frames [9].

Tokyo's skyscraper had only minor non-structural amends after the Tohoku quake [38]. Retrofitting plans for older buildings, an early admonition system, and a public instruction political campaign are included in Tokyo's quake resiliency scheme [39].

**Table4: Case Studies of Resilient Building Design**

| City | Disaster Type | Key Resilient Features | Outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|
| Christchurch, NZ | Earthquake | Base isolation, low-damage design, redundant frames | Operational critical services, 50% lower repair costs |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| New Orleans, USA | Hurricane, Flood | Elevated homes, green infrastructure, storm-resilient materials | Reduced flood risks, improved adaptive capacity |
| Tokyo, Japan | Earthquake | Tuned mass dampers, dual seismic systems, ductile steel frames | Minor damage, rapid post-event recovery |

## VI. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS IN IMPLEMENTING RESILIENT DESIGN

Widespread acceptance of resilient building designing faces a scope of technical, economic, insurance policy and social challenge. Understanding the barrier is needed to develop practical schemes to advance resiliency. There are key restrictions that hamper the execution of resilient building practice.

### 6.1 High Upfront Costs and Financial Constraints

One of the main barriers to resilient building is perceived higher initial cost. Material, labour, and designing cost can be increased by features such as quake base of operations closing off [5].

Although resilient design can lead to a long-conditioning nest egg by reducing fixed cost and downtime, developers and owners often prioritize short-condition economic consideration in low- and middle-income areas [37]. Limited access to resiliency-focused funding mechanism makes this worse.

Many monetary value-welfare analyses fail to fully capture the societal and economic nest egg from avoided disaster impact [40].

### 6.2 Lack of Standardized Performance-Based Codes

While public performance-based designing models exist for quake resiliency, comprehensive standards addressing multiple jeopardy such as flood, hurricane, and wildfire remain fragmented or non-mandatory [17].

Minimum compressive strength is still mandated in many states. The codification-based design neglects some aspects that are important to resiliency [4]. Variation in jeopardy vulnerability, urban denseness, and socio-economic context make it difficult to adopt universal resiliency standards across regions.

### 6.3 Limited Stakeholder Awareness and Expertise

There is a deficiency of consciousness among key stakeholders. Many building professionals don't know about the long-condition benefit of resilient practice or are not familiar with advanced technology like ego-healing material [7]. Disaster hazard may be underestimated by the building owner.

In most states, public instruction political campaigns on resiliency are inadequate [2].

### 6.4 Policy and Governance Gaps

Effective resilient construction depends heavily on supportive policy frameworks. disaster hazard direction policy that bridges urban preparation, substructure evolution, environmental conservation, and climate version are missing [1].

Building permits and zoning regulations fail to incentivize resilient building because policy markets do not differentiate between resilient and non-resilient property. marketplace signals do not adequately reward resiliency investing. The reconstruction of vulnerable structure perpetuates future hazard due to the fact that post-disaster rebuilding attempt prioritize velocity over resiliency

### 6.5 Evolving Risks Due to Climate Change

Climate alteration is making natural disasters more unpredictable. Traditional designing practices based on historical jeopardy information are no longer sufficient as floods become more intense and wildfire season longer [42]. Changing menace necessitates flexible, adaptive, and redundant solutions that can evolve with changing weather.

**Table5: Key Challenges in Resilient Building Design**

| Challenge | Impact on Resilient Design |
|---|---|
| High upfront costs | Discourages investment despite long-term benefits |
| Lack of standardized codes | Inconsistent design practices across regions |
| Limited stakeholder awareness | Poor adoption of advanced resilient technologies |
| Policy and governance gaps | Weak enforcement and lack of incentives |
| Evolving risks from climate change | Increased design complexity and uncertainty |

## VII. Conclusion and Future Work

### 7.1 Conclusion

A fundamental shift in the manner how buildings are conceived, designed, and constructed is required to overcome the threat of natural disasters. In this paper, resiliency building designing moves beyond compressive strength-based approach to embrace resiliency, rapid convalescence and operational persistence in the human face of jeopardy. The inquiry states that effective resilience requires jeopardy-specific schemes such as quake base of operations closing off, inundation-elevated structure, Hurricane-resistant system, and wildfire-cogent evidence material.

From a detailed instance study, it was clear that resilient structures not only survive disaster but also minimize downtime. High upfront cost, gap in public performance-based regulatory model, limited stakeholder consciousness, and the uncertainty introduced by climate alteration are limiting the widespread acceptance of resilient practice.

From the earliest phase of preparation, resiliency must become a rule. coaction among engineer, architect, policymakers, and community is essential to foster invention, ensure economic feasibility, and promote a civilization of resiliency that addresses both current and future hazard

### 7.2 Future Work

Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning should be integrated into resiliency preparation and direction. Predicting hazards can be done with real-time detector information, care agenda, and early warning. The determination reinforcement system can change the manner exigency responses are done.

The promotion of transformable architectural design is important for the future. Changing environmental weather can make buildings capable of adjusting their physical configuration. inquiry into modular components and flexible building systems can lead to invention.

There is an urgent demand to unify resiliency. Future buildings must reduce their carbon footprint. The evolution of net-zero resilient building that contributes to the climate version attempt will require discovery in low carbon building material, renewable free energy integrating, and the evolution of net-zero resilient building.

The constitution of comprehensive, multi-hazard public performance-based building code is important for evolution. Current standards remain largely hazard-specific and geographically fragmented. cascading and chemical compound disaster hazard must be considered by future code.

Finally, resiliency schemes must have to be centered around community interests. Future work should focus on participatory resiliency preparation and planning involving community in hazard detection and post-disaster convalescence scheme. A community interests-driven model enhances the long-term sustainability of resiliency initiatives.

## REFERENCES


[1] UNDRR, Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015, United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, 2015.

[2] C. Scawthorn, "Disaster-resilient construction and sustainable development," Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1-7, 2008.

[3] M. Bruneau, S. E. Chang, R. T. Eguchi, G. C. Lee, A. M. Reinhorn, and D. von Winterfeldt, "A framework to quantitatively assess and enhance the seismic resilience of communities," Earthquake Spectra, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 733-752, 2003.

[4] A. Rose, "Defining and measuring economic resilience to disasters," Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 307-314, 2004.

[5] R. O. Hamburger and M. J. Gillengerten, "Performance-based design of structures for earthquake resistance," Proceedings of 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Auckland, New Zealand, 2000.

[6] F. Pacheco-Torgal, "Eco-efficient construction and building materials: life cycle assessment (LCA), eco-labeling and case studies," Woodhead Publishing, 2013.

[7] B. Ayyub, "Systems resilience for multihazard environments: Definition, metrics, and valuation for decision making," Risk Analysis, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 340-355, 2014

[8] K. Tierney, "Disaster resilience: A social science perspective," Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware, 2007.

[9] I. Takewaki, "Building control with passive dampers: Optimal performance-based design for earthquakes," John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

[10] M. Tomazevic, "Earthquake-resistant design of masonry buildings," Imperial College Press, 1999.

[11] J. M. Kelly, "Earthquake-resistant design with rubber," Springer-Verlag, London, 1997.

[12] H. M. Jonkers, "Self-healing concrete: A biological approach," Self-Healing Materials, Springer, 2007.

[13] D. Eisenberg, L. A. Lichtenstein, and M. Reed, "Sustainability and building codes," Environmental Building News, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1-6, 2001.

[14] Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Prestandard and Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings, FEMA 356, Washington D.C., 2000.

[15] Applied Technology Council (ATC), Guidelines for Seismic Performance Assessment of Buildings, ATC-58, Redwood City, California, 2012.

[16] EERI, The 1995 Kobe (Hyogo-Ken Nanbu) Earthquake Reconnaissance Report, Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, 1996.

[17] FEMA, Prestandard and Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings (FEMA 356), Washington D.C., 2000.

[18] FEMA, Home Builder's Guide to Coastal Construction, FEMA P-499, 2010.

[19] U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Flood Proofing Regulations, EP 1165 2 314, 1995.

[20] M. Levitan, "Wind resistance of residential construction," Natural Hazards Review, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 14–22, 2006.

[21] FEMA, Safe Rooms for Tornadoes and Hurricanes: Guidance for Community and Residential Safe Rooms, FEMA P-361, 2008.

[22] National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Final Report on the Witch and Guejito Fires in Southern California, NIST Special Publication 1137, 2010.

[23] J. Cohen, "Preventing disaster: Home ignitability in the wildland-urban interface," Journal of Forestry, vol. 98, no. 3, pp. 15–21, 2000.

[24] H. M. Jonkers and E. Schlangen, "Development of a bacteria-based self-healing concrete," Tailor Made Concrete Structures: New Solutions for our Society, CRC Press, 2008, pp. 425–430.

[25] M. S. Alam and M. A. Youssef, "Seismic behavior of concrete columns reinforced with superelastic shape memory alloys," Engineering Structures, vol. 29, no. 10, pp. 2618–2625, 2007.

[26] C. R. Farrar and K. Worden, "An introduction to structural health monitoring," Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, vol. 365, no. 1851, pp. 303–315, 2007.

[27] Y. H. Hsu and C. C. Loh, "Application of wireless sensor networks for real-time health monitoring of structures," Advances in Structural Engineering, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 61–72, 2011.

[28] R. Sacks, C. M. Eastman, G. Lee, and P. Teicholz, BIM Handbook: A Guide to Building Information Modeling for Owners, Managers, Designers, Engineers and Contractors, 2nd ed., Wiley, 2011.

[29] FEMA, Next Generation Performance-Based Seismic Design Guidelines, FEMA P-58-1, 2012.

[30] S. Madakam, R. Ramaswamy, and S. Tripathi, "Internet of Things (IoT): A Literature Review," Journal of Computer and Communications, vol. 3, pp. 164–173, 2015.

**[31]** M. Yamamoto, "Development of an earthquake early warning system in Japan," Seismological Research Letters, vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 233–238, 2005.
**[32]** F. Pacheco-Torgal, J. Castro-Gomes, and S. Jalali, "Alkali-activated binders: A review. Part 1. Historical background, terminology, reaction mechanisms and hydration products," Construction and Building Materials, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 1305–1314, 2008.
**[33]** M. J. Sullivan and J. A. Kam, "Performance-based design in the Christchurch rebuilding," Structural Engineering International, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 204–209, 2012.
**[34]** New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering (NZSEE), Seismic Performance of Christchurch Buildings, 2011.
**[35]** J. D. Elwood, "Performance of concrete buildings in the 2010–2011 Christchurch earthquakes," Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 211–220, 2013.
**[36]** Make It Right Foundation, Building Resilient Communities: Lessons from New Orleans, 2015.
**[37]** R. Burby, "Hurricane Katrina and the paradoxes of government disaster policy," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 604, no. 1, pp. 171–191, 2006.
**[38]** S. Aoi et al., "Characteristics of ground motion during the 2011 Tohoku earthquake," Earth, Planets and Space, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 627–630, 2011.
**[39]** Building Research Institute (BRI) of Japan, Earthquake Engineering for Buildings in Japan, 2010.
**[40]** D. Mileti, Disasters by Design: A Reassessment of Natural Hazards in the United States, Joseph Henry Press, 1999.
**[41]** World Bank, Building Resilient Cities: An Overview of Resilience Principles, 2016.
**[42]** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability, Cambridge University Press, 2014.