
Memo

Date	July 3, 2017
Project	Portland Building LU 17-153413 HRMAD
Project No.	74-16113-00
Subject	Follow-up to Staff and Commission Comments from 6/26 Landmarks Hearing

The applicant would like to take this opportunity to respond to several items raised by staff and the Historic Landmarks Commission during our Type III Historic Resource Review hearing on June 26, 2017 prior to the closing of the record.

We heard the following concerns and would like to provide additional comment and/or explanation:

1. The Commission requested additional information regarding alternate cladding materials explored and reasons that aluminum panel was selected.
 - a. **Response:** *The applicant is providing (attached) a matrix showing other materials considered and summary of why they were not selected.*

2. The Commission voiced concerns over the thickness of the rainscreen system being proposed and inquired if there were options to make the system thinner.
 - a. **Response:** *The proposed rainscreen system is a unitized curtainwall. This type of curtainwall system consists of factory assembled units that contain the cladding, framing and insulation in sealed panels. The thickness of the panels represented in our proposal is largely driven by the thickness of insulation needed to meet energy code. The remainder of the thickness is a 3 ½" air space that also functions as the attachment zone. The air space is sized to accommodate the anchors that hold the units to the building and must also account for variations in the existing concrete wall. On the Portland Building these variations are substantial. Preliminary surveys show that the concrete surface varies by up to 1 ½". As noted by Commissioner Mahoney, there is another way to assemble a rainscreen system (stick-built curtainwall). It would not substantially reduce the thickness of the overall assembly. The same thickness of insulation would still be required and a stick-built system would still have to deal with the same variations in the existing concrete. The other disadvantages to the stick-built system is that it is entirely field installed. Factory assembled panels are put together in an environment where temperature, humidity, light and other factors can be controlled to ensure optimal assembly conditions, whereas field assembly is subject to weather fluctuations and other variables that make it difficult to achieve the best installation.*
There were also concerns stated about the thickness of the rainscreen system substantially increasing the depth of the window openings. While not addressed in the proposal, the applicant intends to remove the existing furring wall that is currently located at the inside

face of the concrete. The proposed treatment would mitigate the increase in depth at the exterior by removing the depth of the furring wall at the interior.

3. The commission voiced concerns that the black joint color accentuated the increase in tile size.
 - a. **Response:** *The applicant is proposing a lighter color for the joint material that will still represent the original installation type, but not accentuate the joints. See updated material page 112 for proposed joint color.*

4. The commission and staff both raised concerns with the air handling units located on the west half of the roof. While it was acknowledged that the proposal addressed the sightline criteria, there were concerns about the mechanical being viewed from other locations or surrounding buildings. Requests were made that the applicant explore reducing equipment size and/or screening options.
 - a. **Response:** *As stated in the hearing, the applicant is unable to meet the request to reduce equipment size or eliminate units located on the roof. The roof is the only viable location for the equipment considering the fundamental project goals of improving interior air quality for occupants and achieving energy efficient operation. The applicant has put a great deal of effort into ensuring that the equipment layout is symmetrical and orderly and that it is not visible to pedestrians. Per Commission request, the applicant has explored screening options with our engineering team and has determined the following:*
 - i. *In order to accommodate necessary air flow, any equipment screen would have to be placed approximately 4' outside the units. This would place the screen closer to the parapet and significantly increase the visibility of this element. (See attached roof plan diagram)*
 - ii. *The existing roof deck is a relatively thin concrete slab and would require additional structural improvements to support a mechanical screen and resist the wind loads.*
 - iii. *The equipment is being attached to the roof in such a way that we are able to maintain a significant portion of the building's existing green roof. A structural enclosure would have a significant impact on the extent and performance of the existing green roof.*

5. The commission expressed concerns over potential for the property to be delisted from the National Register and, as a result, the building losing the protection from demolition that listing provides. It was also requested that the applicant reach out to NPS/SHPO to see if they would review the updated proposal and provide additional comment.
 - a. **Response:** *The applicant has reached out to both NPS and SHPO. We are submitting for your information a memo composed by Jessica Engeman at Venerable that outlines communications with NPS/SHPO and further clarifies many of the questions raised by Commission regarding NPS/SHPO role and the delisting process. Additionally, the City is*

willing to adopt a covenant on the building that would require the building to undergo a Type IV Demolition Review in the event that demolition is considered in the future. The City is also open to pursuing a local landmarks listing.

6. Staff report contained a recommendation to retain existing tile at the loggia columns. As the seismic upgrade scheme requires these columns to have a structural wrap, the applicant provided an alternate proposal to retain the existing historic tile at the main entry. Commission seemed to agree that this would provide the historic fabric that staff was seeking and retain it in its original historic context.
 - a. **Response:** *The applicant is providing updated pages amending the submittal to show this area of tile retained. See attached updated proposal pages 46, 47, 49, 73, 74, & 111.*

7. Staff report contained a condition for approval that requested clarification for the depth of the reveals in the tower portion of the building and ensuring that they were similar in depth to the existing concrete reveals.
 - a. **Response:** *The details noted in the staff report were missing notation and dimensions. The applicant has corrected these details to confirm that the intent is to match existing reveal depth. See attached updated page 91 of the submittal.*

8. Staff report contained a condition for approval that requested an alternate proposal for the indirect light fixture in the loggia. Commission seconded that request.
 - a. **Response:** *As noted at the hearing, the selected fixture fulfilled specific performance requirements. The design team was able to work out a few options that meet the performance requirements and would all be acceptable to the design team. See attached loggia renderings (pages 73a-c) with fixture options for consideration by the commission.*

9. Staff report contained a condition for approval that requested an interpretive display in the right of way on 5th Avenue or in the loggia area.
 - a. **Response:** *The applicant would like to clarify that we agree and recognize the importance of acknowledging the changes to the building and telling that story. We believe that we can accommodate either location, however, locating materials in the right-of-way would require discussion with PBOT to obtain their approval. We will also work with our historic preservation and environmental graphics consultants to develop content and format.*