ERRATA


In the above paper, Figure 33 referred to data in Table 8. The data in Table 8 were correct, but Figure 33 was incorrectly produced, and as such did not reflect the correct information. Table 8 and the correct version of Figure 33 are reproduced below. Furthermore, recognising the significance of the recent M7.1 Darfield earthquake, the estimated %NBS of URM buildings in the historic Canterbury Province is highlighted in the updated version of Figure 33.

Table 8: Estimated number of potentially earthquake prone and earthquake risk URM buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Potentially earthquake prone</th>
<th>Potentially earthquake risk</th>
<th>Unlikely to be significant risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawke's Bay</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago and Southland</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33: Estimated %NBS of URM buildings in Provinces throughout New Zealand.