

From: Paul Gouveia
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: [User Approved] Reenforcement of masonry buildings
Date: Thursday, June 14, 2018 9:18:35 AM

This should be the number one priority in Portland. I was close to the epicenter of the Loma Prieta Earthquake in California. There were only a few 1-2 story brick buildings and they crumbled and killed people. Every time I go into Jefferson HS for an event I get frightened for my son's life just seeing the disrepair of such an old building. I then think of how many schools in Portland will crumble and kill kids if we have an earthquake during the school day. When I am downtown I also shudder when I think of all of the tall, masonry buildings and bridges that are not re-enforced. I want to know who is voting against an immediate requirement of serious structural changes to buildings that house school kids and Portland citizens!

Sent from my iPhone

From: TERESA MCGRATH
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony; Wheeler, Mayor; Commissioner Fritz; Commissioner Fish; Commissioner Eudaly; Commissioner Saltzman](#)
Subject: the urm city council we attended yesterday morning/afternoon
Date: Thursday, June 14, 2018 7:22:00 AM

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/video/player/?tab=council>

dear mayor and city council,

we were there yesterday....

thx for the informative session yesterday on the urm...

we urge you to listen to the first 6 clergy testimony on the urm again, at min 3:41:44.....

the clergy sector spoke honestly, given the history of portland, and all the urban renewal/redlining that has occurred for decades...

you have an opportunity to right the ship..

please exempt all mom/pop, churches, non-profits from this mandate as originally proposed, re building 3/4....

primarily, you should only focus on emerg gas shutoffs, as this is affordable for some, and is the cause of many fires during a quake..

i have lived thru them in l.a., in 1971, just a little crack in our chimney, that's it...

the epicenter was a few miles away...

the coast with the tsunami, is the real threat, not portland...

a 9.0 will level portland no matter what bracing is used...

fear mongering doesn't aid in this mandate..

hopefully the public will be better informed regarding these issues that affect all portlanders...

thx,

teresa mcgrath and nat kim

3344 ne 15 97212/442 ne sumner 97211

From: Allison Pynch
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM Retrofit Mandate Comments
Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 1:57:20 PM
Attachments: i

I am a local engineer, the President of the Oregon Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and a resilience specialist. I am dismayed to see that we are potentially weakening the mandate on URM retrofits. As public officials, engineers, and infrastructure owners, we need to do all that we can to increase our infrastructure resilience so that our communities can actually survive a large earthquake. The science is there, thus as professionals, and anyone responsible for public lives, we can no longer ignore the imminent hazard.

What is more troubling are the arguments against increasing requirements. I have addressed a few of these points below.

1. Losing historic buildings – Yes, we may lose a few due to costs of retrofits, or because they are not retrofittable at a reasonable cost. *But if they are not retrofitted, we will lose them all and endanger lives in the meantime.* The originally proposed timelines are generous and should give building owners time to consider how to meet the requirements to help save some of our historic buildings, but also significantly reduce our casualties in an earthquake.
2. Marginalized Populations – it has been very obvious in all the recent disasters that those populations that are less fortunate or marginalized are hit the hardest. They are not as prepared, do not have support or back-up from savings, do not have jobs that can be done from home or in another location, or family support, and need the most support from government. They often also never recover.
3. Minority populations – I saw a lot of discussion today about minority populations being against these mandates. In Oregon, these populations are also often less fortunate and without a social network that can support them here after the disaster. I would imagine they will all leave. A large disaster could actually significantly decrease our diversity.
4. Further, these marginalized and minority populations are the ones that need your protection the most! They are in danger in these buildings. It is your responsibility to protect them from fixable hazards.

I also advise against passing a weakened version of the mandates. The lesser fixes will actually create a false sense of safety and make it possible for building owners to advertise that improvements were made, even if those improvements do little to provide a safer building for residents. The lesser fixes also will not save historic buildings.

In summary, I urge you to enforce the originally proposed mandates. The point of building codes is not to be popular, but it is to have the best interests of all sectors of the general public in mind. Mandatory seismic retrofits are in EVERYONE's best interest. They will save lives and historic buildings.

Allison M Pyrch, PE, GE Associate Geotechnical Engineer

D: 360.816.7398 | O: 360.448.4189 | C: 503.758.6492

Hart Crowser, Inc. | 300 West 15th Street, Vancouver, WA 98660

Oregon | 6420 Macadam Avenue, Suite 100, Portland, OR 97239

allison.pyrch@hartcrowser.com



From: Kay Mattson
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM Mandate - Support and Strengthen it!
Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:08:59 AM
Attachments: [City of Portland URM Letter in support of mandate and strengthening it Kay Mattson 6-11-18.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners Eudaly, Fish, Fritz and Saltzman,

I am writing this letter in support of the mandate and to strengthening it, not weakening, it as some of the amendments made to it do.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warm regards,

Kay D. Mattson

International Public Health/WASH Humanitarian Response/Development Consultant
email: kdmattson11@outlook.com

June 11, 2018

TO: Mayor Ted Wheeler
Commissioner Chole Eudaly
Commissioner Nick Fish
Commissioner Amanda Fritz
Commissioner Dan Saltzman
CC: City Council Testimony

From: Kay Mattson
International Public Health/WASH Humanitarian Response/Development Consultant

RE: URM Mandatory Retrofit Policy

I am writing this letter to express my concern that the City of Portland is considering backing off its proposed plans to strengthen URM mandates for Portland URM buildings, including increasing the amount of time for retrofits from 10 to 20 years. **I am in opposition of weakening the mandate and to the increase in time of the mandate from 10 to 20 years, this memo shares why.**

I attended the May 2, 2018 City Council meeting and listened to the panel presentation and to almost all of the anti-mandate save URM building advocates. Since that time I have further explored the issue. While I do not currently live in Portland I did from 1987 through 2004. During that time for I lived in an URM apartment complex on NW 20th and Northrup for several years and for ten years I worked for the Housing Authority of Portland (now Home Forward) at SW 2nd and Ash, also a URM building. While at HAP I served as the program planning manager for a variety of housing-social service agency partnership projects, manager of several homeless and at-risk of homelessness rental housing assistance programs for families and people with disabilities, and as a social service planning co-lead on the HOPE VI Columbia Villa revitalization planning and successful HUD application. I now work as an international public health/WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene)/Development consultant. In this role I conduct assessments and evaluate projects; many of which have been evaluations of projects responding to disasters such as the 2007 Sumatra earthquake and tsunami and the 2010 Haiti earthquake. My clients have included Mercy Corps, UNICEF, the American Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and other NGOs. In addition to my work my husband is Chris Goldfinger, the expert panelist who provided testimony to the risk for the Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake at the May 2 meeting. This article published yesterday captures well the many sentiments of scientists, responders and engineers <https://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/398142-292400-quake-expert-portland-needs-to-shake-up-seismic-retrofits>. Through Chris and his colleagues (engineer and geological) I have been very exposed to the science on Cascadia and have attended numerous trainings, sessions and conferences on earthquake risks and associated preparedness. I recently attended the FEMA P-50 and P51 trainings, held by OEM, to increase my knowledge and skills with respect to assessments and retrofitting for earthquakes for houses (detached single family wood frame). I see myself as an educated advocate for Cascadia preparedness/risk-prevention and resiliency.

My main reason for writing you is I want to request that you please do not back down and water down the proposed mandates! I have seen the effects of poor infrastructure and poor planning in Ache and Haiti following earthquake events. Not only did buildings collapse and thousands of lives lost, but for YEARS after the events people lived in IDP camps (Internally Displaced Camps) because they had no wear to live. You may say well – “we are not a developing country and we will not be that impacted”, however our infrastructure, particularly our URM buildings, are NOT well developed. Further the recovery cost will be high regardless of what we do now, we should work now to reduce that impact. If we continue to do nothing, or attempt some “light fixes” such as proposed, that will give us a false sense of security and perhaps ultimately cost more money for both the retrofit as well as the clean up after it fails in an earthquake. It may also not protect lives, the entire purpose of retrofitting – thus giving URM building residents a false sense of security.

Those in opposition to the mandates are saying that this is all about a “land grab”, “displacement” and event yes “destruction”. It appears that in their eyes the earthquake is a far off fantasy that will not cause the very things they are fighting against. We know that it is not a fantasy based on the science. Further we don’t know enough about the faults that run through Portland and their frequency of going off, so the risk is in fact much higher when considering all earthquake risks. The 6.8 Nisqually earthquake that occurred in Washington in 2001 should also serve as a wakeup call for us. That earthquake caused 2-4 billion dollars (depending upon sources), most of which was to URM buildings. It was a relatively small earthquake.

The City needs take a leadership stance on this issue – for life and safety and long term sustainability of Oregon’s largest city. I think the policy should move forward as originally designed, not with the recent proposed amendments and even perhaps strengthened. If its implementation needs to be put off a year to refine (not delude it) that seems acceptable. Here are some of the things I think refinement should address:

- Yes prioritize schools and other facilities (class 1 and 2 in your proposal), but do not take off the table other buildings.
- Work to develop a matrix of the existing URM buildings and priority for retrofitting (among class 3 and 4 buildings). Not all are the same. Some should be replaced (e.g. the risk for failure is high, not historically significant or the ROI is not worth retrofitting). Priority should be placed on buildings’ that house people, particularly low-income and middle-income people with those buildings identified to be eligible for greater assistance for retrofitting or perhaps replacement as needed.
- Work to provide funding for low-income and maybe middle-income renters/owners (sliding scale?) that may be displaced during retrofitting and work to ensure that rehabilitated buildings rents remain the same, or similar, after retrofitting and that tenants have first rights to return (the HOPE VI tenant relocation program as well as other Home Forward renovation programs could serve as models for this).
- Yes we should work for affordable funding options for building owners that need additional resources to fix their buildings; however this should be done transparently. It is clear that some owners that are in opposition to this own multi-million dollar buildings with high rent tenants and appear to not want to pay the cost to rehabilitate. Some of these same owners, will be the first after the quake to ask FEMA and others for money to repair or tear down their building.

The government should not bear the burden of private owners who have the resources to fix their buildings, but choose not to. Yes it is unfortunate, but it's not the City's fault – the earthquake risk just is – placing blame to avoid responsibility is misdirected. When one owns real estate there are risks to owning and if owners are not prepared to deal with those risks when they arise perhaps they should not be owners. I know this sounds harsh – but it's a reality. That said I fully support affordable financing options, grants, etc, to support those that cannot pay and to lighten the load on those that can.

- The city (or via a contract) should consider hiring an ombudsman agent(s) who would retain all the necessary information on how to go about implementing the retrofits for building owners as a one-stop source of information to assist owners make sense of the paper work and associate processes and provide links to “certified” retrofitters. This would address some of the confusion URM building owners expressed at the Council meeting. A similar office (position) could be created for occupants of buildings, again the Home Forward model for HOPE VI and other rehabilitation projects could be useful here.
- It appears that the City may not have enforced (per testimony provided) its existing laws and this should be researched and corrected immediately, with systems put in place to ensure that such incidents do not occur again in the future.
- Fully support placarding buildings now to raise awareness, particularly of tenants of the risk to the buildings they live in. The City should extend this to all buildings, not just URMs. This will work to raise awareness and hopefully lead to people supporting more financing to fix OUR problem.

Questions the board should be considering in its decision making process:

- Who will be responsible for the cost of buildings that fail (for repairing or tearing down and debris removal) during a Cascadia event? If softening the mandate and kicking it down the road now does nothing – the cost will come eventually. Are we into prevention or are we into paying later?
- Who will be responsible for lives lost due to building failures?
- What is more important an old building or human lives?
- Should these decisions be based on science and evidence and good planning or emotions, fear and speculation?
- If you or a family member lived in an URM building – would you want it fixed now if you had a definitive date for the earthquake? Remember when Tahoku hit there was a 20% chance that it would happen at that time. We have the data on Cascadia – our risk is the same – we can't claim ignorance.

Thank you for your time. I hope that you will make the right decision on this matter!

From: Christine Colasurdo
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#)
Cc: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: VOTE NO and REVISE mandate regarding historic buildings
Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 9:35:20 AM

Dear City Council and Mayor Wheeler:

I am writing to voice my strong support for Portland's historic buildings. I cannot attend the 10 a.m. hearing but want you to know that I am strongly opposed to the mandate the way it is currently written

Please vote no today. Please revise the mandate to preserve and protect Portland's history.

I grew up in Portland and remember many historic buildings that have now been destroyed. We are erasing Portland's history. And for what? For generic, uninspired, run-of-the-mill skyscrapers that block views of Mount Hood and the Cascades.

Please show your leadership and protect Portland's history! Our older buildings are the essence of Portland's charm. We are a nothing-city without our older structures.

Thank you,
Christine Colasurdo
2776 SW Old Orchard Road
Portland, OR 97201

From: Kathy Reese
To: [deborah.otenburg](mailto:deborah.otenburg@gmail.com)
Cc: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Re: URM Retrofit Mandate
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 9:10:13 PM

Great letter, Debbie!

On Tue, Jun 12, 2018 at 6:27 PM, deborah.otenburg <deborah.otenburg@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Wheeler,

I am writing to urge you to strengthen your position on the unreinforced masonry (URM) mandate under consideration. As a Team Leader of my Sellwood-Moreland, Brooklyn, and Eastmoreland Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET), and as a longtime resident of Portland, I have watched this debate carefully and have considered the concerns of all affected parties.

The science is in: The Cascadia fault will rupture again. It is not a matter of if, but rather of when. When the next mega quake does happen, our URM buildings will crumble, and innocent people inside and outside of these buildings will lose their lives because we failed to make this issue a priority.

The recommendations put forth by the URM Policy Committee were already a compromise between life safety and fiscal concerns. The City Council appears to have taken these watered down recommendations as the high mark, and anchored itself to these as it cut back on this requirement, and extended the time frame on that one. These were carefully crafted recommendations, meant to offer minimum life safety protection, and had already given sufficient weight to the financial implications of a mandate.

I attended the May 9th, 2018 City Council URM hearing. I listened to the arguments from the group Save Portland Buildings, and I heard the members' concerns. I noted this issue being framed as a conspiracy by wealthy developers and retrofitting contractors aiming to cash in by some members of this group. While I would hope that the Council knows better, when I hear Council members express concerns about financial interest disclosures, I wonder. Geology researchers, professional engineering associations, and the Mayor of Christchurch have nothing to gain from a retrofit mandate in Portland, I must point out, and I fail to see what our bureau of emergency management has to gain by putting forth unnecessary recommendations. In the spirit of full disclosure, though, I have no financial dog in this fight. As a renter, I am as vulnerable to swings in the rental market as anyone, and as a single parent, perhaps more so. My bottom line will likely be affected negatively in the short term should a mandate be adopted, I am aware. I am also aware, as a student of emergency management, of the impact a Cascadia event will have on Portland's housing market as it stands. Given the number of URMs in our city, and the number of units of these offering affordable housing, our 'housing crisis' is yet to come if we do not adopt a stringent mandate that protects not only people, but also the buildings that they live in.

I understand the concerns surrounding displacing vulnerable people during the retrofit process, and this concerns me, too. While it is necessary for financial solutions to be developed to provide relief for building owners and their tenants as changes are implemented, to continue to twiddle our thumbs on this issue and hope that a solution falls

into our laps shows a lack of compassion. Disasters hit vulnerable communities the hardest, and we can look to other disasters to see the outcomes of placing already vulnerable people in even more vulnerable locations. (Katrina. Vanport. Almost every other disaster in U.S. history.) We have the examples before us. We don't need to learn the lessons (again) for ourselves.

Finally, I appeal to the Council's sensibility. How is our denial of the Cascadia Subduction Zone threat different from the denial of climate change? How does our reluctance toward mandating retrofits here differ from the reluctance of business towards mandated emissions standards? We aren't *that guy*. We are Portland.

Thank You for Your Consideration.

Respectfully Yours,

Deborah Otenburg

Co-Team Leader, Sellwood-Moreland/Brooklyn/Eastmoreland NET
[Sellwood NET Facebook](#)

--

Kathy Reese
Argay-Parkrose NET - Team Leader
503-419-8033
[Argay-Parkrose NET on Facebook](#)
[Portland Prepares - Argay-Parkrose](#)

From: [deborah otenburg](#)
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM Retrofit Mandate
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 6:28:07 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler,

I am writing to urge you to strengthen your position on the unreinforced masonry (URM) mandate under consideration. As a Team Leader of my Sellwood-Moreland, Brooklyn, and Eastmoreland Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET), and as a longtime resident of Portland, I have watched this debate carefully and have considered the concerns of all affected parties.

The science is in: The Cascadia fault will rupture again. It is not a matter of if, but rather of when. When the next mega quake does happen, our URM buildings will crumble, and innocent people inside and outside of these buildings will lose their lives because we failed to make this issue a priority.

The recommendations put forth by the URM Policy Committee were already a compromise between life safety and fiscal concerns. The City Council appears to have taken these watered down recommendations as the high mark, and anchored itself to these as it cut back on this requirement, and extended the time frame on that one. These were carefully crafted recommendations, meant to offer minimum life safety protection, and had already given sufficient weight to the financial implications of a mandate.

I attended the May 9th, 2018 City Council URM hearing. I listened to the arguments from the group Save Portland Buildings, and I heard the members' concerns. I noted this issue being framed as a conspiracy by wealthy developers and retrofitting contractors aiming to cash in by some members of this group. While I would hope that the Council knows better, when I hear Council members express concerns about financial interest disclosures, I wonder. Geology researchers, professional engineering associations, and the Mayor of Christchurch have nothing to gain from a retrofit mandate in Portland, I must point out, and I fail to see what our bureau of emergency management has to gain by putting forth unnecessary recommendations. In the spirit of full disclosure, though, I have no financial dog in this fight. As a renter, I am as vulnerable to swings in the rental market as anyone, and as a single parent, perhaps more so. My bottom line will likely be affected negatively in the short term should a mandate be adopted, I am aware. I am also aware, as a student of emergency management, of the impact a Cascadia event will have on Portland's housing market as it stands. Given the number of URMs in our city, and the number of units of these offering affordable housing, our 'housing crisis' is yet to come if we do not adopt a stringent mandate that protects not only people, but also the buildings that they live in.

I understand the concerns surrounding displacing vulnerable people during the retrofit process, and this concerns me, too. While it is necessary for financial solutions to be developed to provide relief for building owners and their tenants as changes are implemented, to continue to twiddle our thumbs on this issue and hope that a solution falls into our laps shows a lack of compassion. Disasters hit vulnerable communities the hardest, and we can look to other disasters to see the outcomes of placing already vulnerable people in even more vulnerable locations. (Katrina. Vanport. Almost every other disaster in U.S. history.) We have the examples before us. We don't need to learn the lessons (again) for ourselves.

Finally, I appeal to the Council's sensibility. How is our denial of the Cascadia Subduction Zone threat different from the denial of climate change? How does our reluctance toward mandating retrofits here differ from the reluctance of business towards mandated emissions standards? We aren't *that guy*. We are Portland.

Thank You for Your Consideration.

Respectfully Yours,

Deborah Otenburg

Co-Team Leader, Sellwood-Moreland/Brooklyn/Eastmoreland NET
[Sellwood NET Facebook](#)

From: Gary Owca
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Cc: ["Rudy Munzel"](#)
Subject: Letter to City Council - Hearing June 13, 2018
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 4:28:31 PM
Attachments: [City Council Letter - Hearing 6-13-18.pdf](#)

Dear Mayor Ted Wheeler & City Council

Please see attached letter relating to the URM proposal and our property located at 6012 SE Yamhill Street Portland, OR 97215.

Your consideration in this matter is sincerely appreciated.

Thank you

Gary Owca
Principal
Rudy Munzel
Principal
Bridgeway Realty Resources LLC
6118 SE Belmont Street STE 39
Portland, OR 97215
503-415-0415

Bridgeway

Realty Resources LLC

Re: URM Proposal

Situs Address: 6012 SE Yamhill

Owner: Reham 6 LLC

Dear Mayor Wheeler and City Council Members:

Our firm owns the former Portland Sanitarium Nurse's Quarters located at 6012 SW Yamhill Street, near the base of Mt. Tabor (the "Smith Blocks" or "Blocks"). We are anxious to commence our planned renovations of the Smith Blocks, which are in their second term of property-tax abatement as historic property. Our renovations will result in the creation of 76 apartments limited to residents having incomes no more than 60%-80% of the area median family income. Not only will our renovations result in badly needed affordable housing, they will do so while preserving the Smith Blocks' historic nature. Importantly, the renovations will include a full seismic upgrade tailored to meet the City's new seismic standards for unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings.

We reach out to you now because we fear that our critical seismic upgrades will trigger a higher property-tax burden upon the historic abatement's expiration in 2027. While we understand that the City may ultimately adopt SB 311, which affords tax relief for owners, like us, who undertake mandatory seismic retrofitting, we also understand that it may take some 18 months or more before that happens. The problem is that we will be renovating the Smith Blocks and installing the seismic upgrades in the very near future—before that relief is available. This poses the very real risk that we are penalized for completing the seismic upgrades early vis-à-vis owners who upgrade only after the URM ordinance takes effect.

We are respectfully seeking the City's help for us and other owners in our situation. Specifically, we ask the Council to create some kind of accommodation for owners like us to insure that they will be no worse off than those owners who complete seismic retrofits only after the URM ordinance is finalized. One possible accommodation is to afford "early adopters" like us retroactive property-tax relief that would put us on a par with post-URM seismic retrofits.

Based on our willingness to provide affordable housing, retain the Smith Blocks' historic nature, and work with surrounding neighbors to address concerns, the Council unanimously granted a zone change to allow our planned renovation of the Blocks. The relief we now request helps ensure that the Smith Blocks remain a viable affordable housing community for many years to come.

Bridgeway

Realty Resources LLC

Your consideration in this matter is sincerely appreciated.

Respectively submitted,



Rudy Munzel



Gary Owca

From: Nancy Stueber
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Re: Resolution | Unreinforced Masonry Building Mandatory Retrofit Implementation Steps
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 4:08:10 PM
Attachments: [OMSI Resolution Unreinforced Masonry Building Mandatory Retrofit Implementation Steps.pdf](#)

Ms. Moore-Love ~

Attached please find OMSI's (Oregon Museum of Science and Industry) presentation on our position regarding the resolution for Unreinforced Masonry Building Mandatory Retrofit Implementation Steps.

Thank you,

Nancy Stueber
President and CEO
Oregon Museum of Science and Industry
1945 SE Water Ave.
Portland, OR 97214 USA
+503-797-4514
E nstueber@omsi.edu | www.omsi.edu

Come meet the coolest robots ever! Robot Revolution on view Mar 17 – Sep 3.

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)
twitter.com/omsi



**Oregon Museum of
Science and Industry**

1945 SE Water Avenue
Portland Oregon 97214
503 797 4000

oms.edu

June 12, 2018

The Portland City Council
cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov

Ms. Karla Moore-Love
Council Clerk
City of Portland
Office of the City Auditor
1221 SW 4th Avenue, Room 130
Portland, OR 97204-1900

Re: Unreinforced Masonry Building Mandatory Retrofit Implementation Steps

Honorable Mayor Wheeler and Portland City Council:

Thank you for the opportunity to present our position on the resolution for Unreinforced Masonry Building Mandatory Retrofit Implementation Steps. OMSI supports the city's efforts to address seismic upgrades for vulnerable unreinforced masonry buildings. However, we believe that the cost estimates for seismic retrofits provided by PBEM staff, based on the standard of Collapse Risk Reduction, significantly undervalue the actual cost. Mandates based on those estimates will not take into account the full cost of building upgrades that will be prohibitively expensive for private owners without commensurate government assistance.

We base this position on the following:

The OMSI museum is essentially comprised of two buildings. The Turbine Hall, formerly owned by PGE, was built in the 1920s. The rest of the museum was built in 1991.

In 2016 and 2017, OMSI voluntarily hired KPFF and GeoDesign to conduct Tier 1, 2, and 3 seismic evaluations of the OMSI museum building and geotechnical evaluation of the site. According to KPFF's study, the south portion of Turbine Hall's SFRS (seismic force-resisting system) is an older construction that consists of a combination of steel and concrete frames with unreinforced infill masonry shear walls. This statement does not classify the Turbine Hall as a URM as currently defined by the PBEM URM Policy Committee. However, in an email from the City of Portland in August 2017, we were advised that the URM Policy Committee is considering changing the definition, which may then qualify the Turbine Hall building as a URM building.

Once KPFF finalized its Tier 3 evaluation, we hired Oppenheim Lewis to cost the plan. This evaluation work alone cost OMSI \$114,000. The overall cost of the seismic reinforcements identified by KPFF is slightly under \$30M.

Of the \$30M in overall costs to seismically retrofit OMSI, over \$14M of these identified costs are specifically for seismically retrofitting the Turbine Hall. The Turbine Hall is 25,000 square feet. The cost per square foot is \$565.39.

The rest of OMSI's museum building, excluding the Turbine Hall, is 194,000 square feet. The cost to seismically retrofit is approximately \$16M, and the cost per square foot is \$82.47.

We will willingly provide OMSI's seismic evaluation and cost estimates as additional data for consideration. We appreciate the thoughtful deliberations of Council on this matter and request further cost analysis be conducted before mandates are determined.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Nancy Stueber". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "N" and "S".

Nancy Stueber
President and CEO
Testifier

From: Margaret Davis
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM mandate
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 3:44:07 PM

Greetings Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners Eudaly, Fish, Fritz, and Saltzman,

I support working with current owners of URM buildings to retrofit and provide reasonable time and options. The fear mongering, however, has got to stop--it's starting to sound like the city will do anything to keep developers putting up their max-size cookie-cutter projects. Character counts in the way we evolve, and what we leave standing.

Let's keep Portland Portland, and our neighborhoods interesting. This anti-Robin Hood of taking from the less affluent to help the wealthy get even wealthier has got to stop. Portland is also in the process being robbed of its soul, identity, and long-held core values. Creativity and quality have long been part of Portland's DNA; working with owners of URM buildings, particularly the small ones, will provide benefits to far more people and this city in the long run.

Plus, it's not sustainable to keep filling the landfill with large non-biodegradable construction waste. We're already putting enough affordable housing in there as it is!

Thank you for listening, Margaret Davis, 4216 NE 47th, 97218

--

[Margaret Davis](#)
Ma Nao Books

manaobooks.com

From: Antjuan Tolbert
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Attention - Proposed resolution by City Council on June 13th
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 3:26:27 PM
Attachments: [URM - Letter to Mayor .pdf](#)

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners,

The NAACP Portland Chapter 1120 in alignment with a consortium of PDX African American Pastors call on city council to abort any movement surrounding the resolution to develop URM retrofit implementation steps immediately.

It is an outrage that there were not ample notifications concerning this measure and zero engagement from communities of color in the process.

The advancement of any resolution without the input of over 1600 properties is unacceptable. They Include, but not limited to: underserved communities, communities of color, religious communities, non-profits, schools, small business owners and those impacted most by displacement as well as higher rent and gentrification.

We are demanding that there be NO movement forward on the proposed resolution by City Council on June 13th and that there be NO movement forward without inclusivity of the process and proper representation of those who are most impacted by this issue.

We demand that the city stops today and allows for immediate communication with a quorum of the Church leaders, community leaders, and stakeholders who have been grossly disenfranchised.

It is unfortunate that in the absence of notice or inclusion in this due process forces us to request an emergency meeting immediately, today, June 12, 2018. The afore mentioned quorum is available to meet with you today at city hall at the time of your choosing.

Non response to this communication will serve as indication of your unwillingness to collaborate. If it be your choosing we will meet you at city hall at the June 13th city council meeting inviting as many of our constituents, family and friends to join us in this most important conversation that affects so many lives.

Thank you

--

Antjuan Tolbert
Assistant to E.D. Mondainé
+++++
Celebration Tabernacle Church
President NAACP Portland
edmondaine.com



June 12th, 2018

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners,

The NAACP Portland Chapter 1120 in alignment with a consortium of PDX African American Pastors call on city council to abort any movement surrounding the resolution to develop URM retrofit implementation steps immediately.

It is an outrage that there were not ample notifications concerning this measure and zero engagement from communities of color in the process.

The advancement of any resolution without the input of over 1600 properties is unacceptable. They Include, but not limited to: underserved communities, communities of color, religious communities, non-profits, schools, small business owners and those impacted most by displacement as well as higher rent and gentrification.

We are demanding that there be NO movement forward on the proposed resolution by City Council on June 13th and that there be NO movement forward without inclusivity of the process and proper representation of those who are most impacted by this issue.

We demand that the city stops today and allows for immediate communication with a quorum of the Church leaders, community leaders, and stakeholders who have been grossly disenfranchised.

It is unfortunate that in the absence of notice or inclusion in this due process forces us to request an emergency meeting immediately, today, June 12, 2018. The afore mentioned quorum is available to meet with you today at city hall at the time of your choosing.

Non response to this communication will serve as indication of your unwillingness to collaborate. If it be your choosing we will meet you at city hall at the June 13th city council meeting inviting as many of our constituents, family and friends to join us in this most important conversation that affects so many lives.

E.D. Mondainé
President | NAACP Portland 1120

From: Lynn Hanrahan
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: 6/13/18 vote on URM Mandate
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 2:38:38 PM

June 11, 2018

To:

Mayor Ted Wheeler
City of Portland
1221 SW 4th Ave
Portland, OR 97204

From:

Lynn Hanrahan
2718 SE Brooklyn St.
Portland, OR 97202
503-231-1398
lynn@lshanrahan.com
steve@lshanrahan.com

Property ownership on URM list:
The Aberdeen Condos, unit #103
1529 SE Hawthorne Blvd

Dear Mayor Wheeler,

In just two days, the City Council will be voting on a mandate regarding Unreinforced Masonry Buildings in the city of Portland. We consider the ramifications of a mandated full retrofit on URM buildings to be monumental. At a time when we have a housing crisis in our city, unleashing this program to include a full retrofit on Class 3 & 4 buildings will result in higher rents, demolitions, gentrification, loss of neighborhood character, loss of jobs, loss of ownership, loss of retirement savings. While some people will be able to afford a retrofit, most will not. Should there be a full mandate, many Portlanders will be in for a shock when they realize how the wonderful look and character of this city is on the chopping block. We have mentioned this program to people throughout the city, and most often, they know nothing of it. We have talked to realtors who know nothing of this effort, and we wonder how can that be? We have looked closely at the city's URM list, and wonder why some buildings are on it, and others are not. In our own experience, our condo building of 14 units had no notice from the city, we only learned by chance in the fall of 2017 that the list existed, and that The Aberdeen was on the list. Two condo owners are trying to sell as a result, and no surprise, there is no interest.

The 100s of people that showed up for the May 9 City Council hearing on URM policy are not anti-safety, nor are they ignorant of the risks of URMS and earthquakes. Rather, what is foremost right now is the risk of an mandate with no plan and a broad brush approach treating all the Class 3 & 4 buildings the same, and at this point a doubt that real financial assistance will be there for owners. We respectfully ask that you put a hold on Class 3 & 4 buildings and help owners find a way forward that will not financially ruin them, while they bring their roofs up to code. Anything further (floors to walls) will need a robust financial assist for most people and that funding should not endanger schools, bridges, hospitals, etc.

We very much appreciate your consideration of our request to move forward with Class 1 & 2, and hold off on Class 3 & 4 until there is a real plan, and real financial aid.

Thank you,

Lynn & Steve Hanrahan

From: Beth Kerschen
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Against Current URM Mandate
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 7:49:06 AM

Dear Commissioner,

I am just writing a quick note to let you know I am against the current URM Mandate.

I am an artist living in Portland Oregon. I create artwork that depicts the city of Portland with its great architecture and culture. My work used to be in the Mayor's office under Sam Adams and I had an installation at the PDX airport. I know Portland's urban landscape well. The URM's are part of city's remaining historical structures. If the city council applied strict seismic upgrades without good financial help, these buildings will be sold to developers, demolished, and something new, without history or character, will be built. The city had already been overhauled with modern buildings, please do something to save some history. There are ways to improve the safety of the URMs without expensive upgrades.

Lastly, the URMs are the last remaining buildings that house affordable art studios. None of the new buildings are for studios nor are they affordable. Many artists I know have been forced out of town due to the high cost of living here and renting studio space. I am only still here because my landlord hasn't gouged me for higher rent - it is rare and I am extremely lucky. If these URMs don't get financial backing the rents will become completely out of reach or we'll lose studio space due to demolition.

Affordable rent allows for more creatives to thrive...the creativity of Portland is a part of what makes Portland attractive. We could lose all culture here with the current URM Mandate - our historic architecture (buildings and churches) and the artists that live and work in these URMs. Please seek other safety and robust financial aid solutions.

Regards,
Beth Kerschen

beth kerschen
www.bethkerschen.com
www.urbanretrospectives.com

From: Evrim Icoz Photography
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Cc: [Evrin Icoz Photography](#)
Subject: Feedback on URM Buildings
Date: Friday, June 8, 2018 1:04:30 PM

This is my feedback on the URM Retrofit mandate that you are considering. I will try to give feedback in the small hope you still might care about low income renters and small businesses.

So in summary: Don't do it. It is a badly planned, not well thought out, and self serving mandate that will hurt a lot of low income renters and small business owners.

I do not want to mince words - the plan is horrible. It will cause quite a few people and business I personally know to suffer irreparable hardship and in most cases, closure. How this can help the most vulnerable group of people and those who are employed at these businesses, I cannot fathom. And it will also affect schools, with less revenue with tax abatement and prioritization of private buildings. I understand that some of your colleagues in the council do not have much love for property owners, but please do think about all those employed at these businesses and low income renters that will be pushed out.

In a time when we have few units available, schools have limited funding and historic character of Portland is under attack, you are trying to mandate a course of action that will make all of these even worse. Less taxes for schools, many many iconic buildings destroyed, many small businesses closed and many low income people driven out since a lot of these buildings will be demolished and gentrified.

This includes many of my friends of my family, quite a few small but iconic businesses I know (sure, they are not luxury condo developers nor rich, but they do matter). This is shameful, not well thought out.

I cannot help but think if Portland City ever care about constituents and people living here, and have real interest in taking feedback, or do they only care about increasing tax revenue through demolitions and new buildings that only help luxury condo developers. I am a very progressive business owner and this is really a terrible idea that will hurt the very people you claim to serve and need help the most. I cannot help but wonder how the Portland City Commission lost their direction and loyalty so badly and why do you not consider what people want and easily thought of consequences.

Evrin Icoz

From: denny lyndsay
To: [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Fw: GROUND ZERO FOR RESILIENCE = INFRASTRUCTURE
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 9:39:44 PM
Importance: High

From: denny lyndsay
Sent: Thursday, June 7, 2018 9:33 PM
To: MayorWheeler@portlandoregon.gov; chloe eudaly; Nick@portlandoregon.gov; Dan@portlandoregon.gov; amanda@portlandoregon.gov
Cc: allan@nwexaminer.com; Angie Even; Perez, Elisabeth; Karin And Tom; Holly Stalder; cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov
Subject: GROUND ZERO FOR RESILIENCE = INFRASTRUCTURE

OK, so I'm estimating that this is somewhere around my 6th or 7th time asking this same question. I have asked it in meetings, in phone calls and several times via email... so here we go again...

WHY IS INFRASTRUCTURE NOT THE STARTING POINT FOR RESILIENCE?

Why would we not be dealing with shut off valves, bridges, fuel lines, liquefaction zones, schools, before turning to the private sector (or as we call it , the low hanging fruit).

Let's pretend I have not said this like a zillion times, but in the SF earthquake 63 people died, 39 OF THEM WERE FROM THE COLLAPSE OF AN OVER PASS. So if this was really about public safety we could look at every single earthquake and the aftermath, what would the Japanese earthquake look like without the tsunami and the nuclear power plant? Hey, we have one of those about 200 miles away, hmmm, guessing it could be a parallel situation .

Done with being Portland polite, answer my question. WHY IS INFRASTRUCTURE NOT GROUND ZERO FOR RESILIENCE.

Tom,Karin so sorry to have included you in this thread, but seriously, cannot get any of them to answer, so casting bigger nets. If you haven't already, read the cities proposed mandates "cart before the horse" again.

I am tired of optics, is it too much to ask of our elected officials to deal with real life facts instead of closed door presentations?

Lyndsay Levy
2530 NW Westover Rd
Portland, 97210
503-490-3887

From: Migaki, Akemi
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#); [Chisek, Kyle](#); [Perez, Elisabeth](#); [Runkel, Marshall](#); [Adamsick, Claire](#); [Grumm, Matt](#)
Cc: [McMonies, Walter W.](#)
Subject: FW: URM Upgrade
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 2:51:47 PM
Attachments: [Testimony re URM.pdf](#)
[May 9, Testimony.pdf](#)

Resending current testimony as well as the May 9 testimony for your reference. Thank you.

Akemi

From: Migaki, Akemi
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 2:42 PM
To: 'cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov' <cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov>;
'kyle.chisek@portlandoregon.gov' <kyle.chisek@portlandoregon.gov>;
'elisabeth.perez@portlandoregon.gov' <elisabeth.perez@portlandoregon.gov>;
'marshall.runkel@portlandoregon.gov' <marshall.runkel@portlandoregon.gov>;
'claire.adamsick@portlandoregon.gov' <claire.adamsick@portlandoregon.gov>;
'matt.grumm@portlandoregon.gov' <matt.grumm@portlandoregon.gov>
Cc: McMonies, Walter W. <McMoniesW@LanePowell.com>
Subject: URM Upgrade

Good afternoon,

Please see attached for Testimony from Walt McMonies. Thank you.



AKEMI MIGAKI
Legal Assistant
miqakia@lanepowell.com
D 503.778.2232
LANEPOWELL.COM

This message is private or privileged. If you are not the person for whom this message is intended, please delete it and notify me immediately, and please do not copy or send this message to anyone else.

From: Michael Schilmoeller
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: In Support of the URM Retrofitting Proposal
Date: Sunday, June 10, 2018 9:22:19 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler:

I am a resident of Portland, and I volunteer for *Portland's Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET)* program. I am emailing you today concerning the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) Council agenda item, scheduled for June 13. I urge Council to take immediate action to require the seismic retrofits of these buildings. The required standard must incorporate a level of retrofit that protects life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy. In the meantime, signage and sidewalk safety awnings capable of withstanding failing walls should be required.

I appreciate that these retrofits will be expensive and may result in some owners being forced to tear down their buildings. I have several thoughts about this, however. First, my own family's investment in property was undertaken with recognition of the associated business risk. There could be environmental problems with the property about which no one knew when we bought the property. There is no question about who would bear the cost of mitigation. Investment always carries risk.

The second thought is that, if it were discovered that because of wiring problems or building materials these buildings were death traps for their inhabitants, we would not be having this debate. The argument that we should wait until after the earthquake to make the repairs, which I have seen in a letter opposed to these upgrades, is extremely callous in my opinion. We need to recognize that the only difference between these sources of risk is our familiarity with them.

Finally, if some means of mitigating the economic impact on building owners cannot be identified, it will represent a failure of imagination and creativity. We are internalizing the external cost of earthquake risk to the public by paying for retrofits. We can also internalize the external value of buildings we deem of architectural, aesthetic, or cultural significance through some kind of credit to the owners.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Michael J. Schilmoeller

From: Richard Vidan
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#)
Cc: [Angie Even](#); [Save Portland Buildings](#); [City Ombudsman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#); [URM Building Work Group](#); [Perez, Elisabeth](#)
Subject: June 13, 2018 City Council meeting-URMs
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 4:26:46 PM

At the May 9, 2018 City Council meeting, Jonna Papaefthimiou, Planning and Resilience Manager for the Portland Bureau of Environmental Management, asserted in oral testimony that the average cost for upgrading a URM to the proposed mandate would be "\$11 a square foot." In what universe is that true?

Ms. Papaefthimiou's cost estimate is ridiculously out of reality. And worse, it smacks of collusion as it based on the conclusions of Reid Zimmermann of KPF Consulting Engineers and Emerick Architects, both of whom have OBVIOUS conflicts of interests as their firms stand to make a ton of money if they can help push through the passage of these draconian mandates. Why were they even on advisory committees in the first place? That is so counter to the basic precepts of transparent democracy. Commissioner Nick Fish has proposed an amendment to the seismic upgrade resolution calling for required disclosure of conflicts of interest by members of a new committee to be formed to advise the city on the implementation of a seismic program. That is so obviously common-sense and just. And democratic. Why were there no small URM owners on the advisory committee? This screams inequality and corporate land-grab.

Steve Rose of the PBEM-appointed URM Support Committee has gone on the record as saying that the \$11 per square foot retrofit cost for mandated seismic upgrades is "completely absurd." The \$11 a square foot figure is complete nonsense and anyone with an IQ higher than room temperature knows it.

This proposed policy could adversely affect thousands of buildings, thousands of building owners, and thousands upon thousands of building tenants. People could possibly be required to come up with millions and millions of dollars of funding to effect upgrades. Funding that NO lenders will provide. Does the City or the State have a governmental loan program to avail these people? Where is that program? What are the parameters of it? The answer is that no such program exists. The City appears to be considering throwing a huge number of people and buildings into huge

turmoil and just sort of hoping everything works out okay. It is a recipe for mass displacements and mass bankruptcies negatively impacting the very character of Portland itself.

Why not prioritize the upgrading of more critical public buildings (hospitals, schools, etc.) first? Why lump wildly disparate buildings into large classes instead of individually evaluating them? Why not first mandate automatic natural gas shut-off valves? Why not first enforce the existing building codes?

**Many questions have been posited in this letter.
Some people have been asking some of these same questions over and over for a long time.
No answers have been forthcoming.**

**Richard and Deborah Vidan
300 NW 10th Ave.
Pearl District
Portland**

From: Dian Gamble
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Keep Portland Portland
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 2:54:05 PM

No Mandate! No Demolitions! No Displacements! No Higher Rents!

Now you have to ask, I'm getting a lot of these and is this person someone that matters?

Not sure how you would know how many people I have pull with.

Dian

From: Sherry Genauer
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: NET and URMs
Date: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 1:46:07 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler:

I am a resident of Portland, and I volunteer for ***Portland's Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET)*** program. NETs are trained to deploy and render aid in the event of a disaster. Last year, NET volunteers contributed over 50,000 hours of volunteer time in service to Portland.

I am emailing you today concerning the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) Council agenda item, scheduled as a Time Certain for June 13. As you know, scientists expect Portland will experience a major earthquake in the future; possibly in the very near future. URMs will likely collapse when the ground shakes, harming occupants and persons in the streets nearby. Portland has over 1,600 of these buildings.

I urge Council to take immediate action to require the seismic retrofits of these buildings before it is too late. The required standard must incorporate a level of retrofit that protects life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy.

NET volunteers will put their lives at risk following a quake to search for survivors. Each retrofitted URM is one less opportunity to put my life, and the lives of 1,700 of my fellow volunteers, at risk.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: Robert Burr
To: [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: No Mandate! No Demolitions! No Displacements! No Higher Rents!
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 11:21:41 AM

Dear Commissioners,

Please respect the integral character of Portland's building stock and preserve old buildings and communities from rapid change that will push up rents and also not allow people on median incomes to live and exist in the city.

Sincerely,

Robert Burr
2414 NE 44th Ave
Portland OR 97213

From: Anthony Coleman
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: NO to Class 3 and 4
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 2:20:04 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners,

My wife and I own a unit in the Wickersham Condominiums in NW Portland. The Wickersham was built in 1910 and is designated on the National Register of Historic Places. It is also one of the URM buildings targeted in your list of structures requiring seismic retrofit upgrading. We are strongly opposed to the adoption of a mandate for URM buildings in classes 3 and 4. Adoption of such a mandate would be prohibitively expensive for us, and we fear that it would have the consequence of forcing us to leave our home and possibly even result in the eventual destruction of the Wickersham. The latter outcome would be a tragedy not only for the residents of the Wickersham but also a tragedy for Portland.

Sincerely,
Anthony Coleman

From: Toni Smith
To: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Dunphy, Jamie](#); [Schmanski, Sonia](#); [Perez, Elisabeth](#)
Subject: Pending Council vote on URM Mandate
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 12:11:05 PM

Dear City Commissioners:

I have been volunteering on behalf of Save Portland Buildings to get the word out about the proposed mandate. The community is outraged. As a city who prides itself on innovative solutions — we are falling short. As a city that attracts residents/corporations because of the culture — support of the arts, music and entrepreneurs this mandate will affect these very groups the most. This is a targeted attack on small business owners. The mandate (as written) will lead to further demolition of our city.

I believe in life safety. I also believe in preservation of Portland's brick buildings. We can do both.

For citywide preparedness, the City can work with local organizations (like Save Portland Buildings):

- to prioritize Critical Buildings, Bridges and Schools First
- early warning detection systems
- install gas shut-off valves city-wide (fire is much bigger danger than bricks falling)
- work with owners of URMs to get their buildings to existing code (24.85)

Recommendation to amend Mandate/Resolution as written to:

- go back to the current code (24.85) and enforce it
- remove all Churches and Community Centers from the list
- no bolts plus (floors to walls)
- give commercial building owners/private sector 30 years to comply

Many more buildings would have been seismically improved in the past 24 years with Code 24.85 if:

- building owners had been notified of their building type
- the code had been enforced
- it had been incentivized for success
- it had been created without extensive loopholes

A Resolution or Mandate will decrease building owner's ability to plan and implement seismic retrofits due the "black cloud" and reduced sources of funding that come with an "in code" building made "out of compliance."

The the URM Committee's final draft recommendation (December) is incomplete and includes inaccurate costs (based on bids members of SPB has received) for phased seismic retrofit. There is not any fiscally realistic and equitable funding sources for these retrofits.

The city's list is horribly inaccurate. In my Canvassing of SE and St. Johns there were hundreds of buildings not on the list that are URMs. These building owners (and tenants) are unaware of the pending mandate. That will certainly lead to litigation with the City.

If the city seeks to create an implementable and realistic pathway forward to increase the seismic safety of our city (while balancing actual costs and architectural preservation values of historic buildings) including floors to walls is prohibitively expensive and will cause the displacement of residential and small business tenants and further demolition.

Create a work group to review the current code with these goals:

- Notification of owners
- Close loopholes in current code (Eliminate roof permit bundling program)
- Fund Incentives for retrofit success:

Equitable and guaranteed funding paired with levels of retrofits

Bond Measure (Public participation / Public benefit)

Waiving of permit fees

- Enforcement – Track progress with timelines and benchmarks
- Review placarding best practices
- Remove online city data base list to increase financing options

These solutions achieve the dual goals of creating more seismically resilient buildings and increases safety of our citizens, while also protecting thousands of local business / building / historic apartment building owners (who maintain much of the last reserve of historically low rents for commercial and residential units) from predatory developers and unfunded mandates. Our city's very character is at stake.

I urge you to:

Prioritize schools, critical and city owned buildings

Prioritize an early warning system

Prioritize bridges, gas tanks and infrastructure

Prioritize gas shut-off valves city-wide.

Prioritize the research of innovation and technology.

The city ought to take the lead with their own buildings, including the 45 schools that haven't been retrofitted since the code was enacted in 1994, but it would be irresponsible for a governmental body to mandate retrofits that they haven't yet budgeted for. It may be more responsible for the city to also follow their own code, and implement a mandate only in coordination with a dedicated source of funding, such as a bond.

I understand this is a very complicated issue and I appreciate the work you are doing.

I believe this is the most important issue facing Portland in the last decade and will have a permanent affect on the soul of our City. Please do your best to preserve the buildings and lives.

Kindest regards,

Toni Smith

*615 SE Main Street
Portland OR 97214
(503) 936 8783*

June 11, 2018

TO: Mayor Ted Wheeler
Commissioner Chole Eudaly
Commissioner Nick Fish
Commissioner Amanda Fritz
Commissioner Dan Saltzman
CC: City Council Testimony

From: Kay Mattson
International Public Health/WASH Humanitarian Response/Development Consultant

RE: URM Mandatory Retrofit Policy

I am writing this letter to express my concern that the City of Portland is considering backing off its proposed plans to strengthen URM mandates for Portland URM buildings, including increasing the amount of time for retrofits from 10 to 20 years. **I am in opposition of weakening the mandate and to the increase in time of the mandate from 10 to 20 years, this memo shares why.**

I attended the May 2, 2018 City Council meeting and listened to the panel presentation and to almost all of the anti-mandate save URM building advocates. Since that time I have further explored the issue. While I do not currently live in Portland I did from 1987 through 2004. During that time for I lived in an URM apartment complex on NW 20th and Northrup for several years and for ten years I worked for the Housing Authority of Portland (now Home Forward) at SW 2nd and Ash, also a URM building. While at HAP I served as the program planning manager for a variety of housing-social service agency partnership projects, manager of several homeless and at-risk of homelessness rental housing assistance programs for families and people with disabilities, and as a social service planning co-lead on the HOPE VI Columbia Villa revitalization planning and successful HUD application. I now work as an international public health/WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene)/Development consultant. In this role I conduct assessments and evaluate projects; many of which have been evaluations of projects responding to disasters such as the 2007 Sumatra earthquake and tsunami and the 2010 Haiti earthquake. My clients have included Mercy Corps, UNICEF, the American Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and other NGOs. In addition to my work my husband is Chris Goldfinger, the expert panelist who provided testimony to the risk for the Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake at the May 2 meeting. This article published yesterday captures well the many sentiments of scientists, responders and engineers <https://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/398142-292400-quake-expert-portland-needs-to-shake-up-seismic-retrofits>. Through Chris and his colleagues (engineer and geological) I have been very exposed to the science on Cascadia and have attended numerous trainings, sessions and conferences on earthquake risks and associated preparedness. I recently attended the FEMA P-50 and P51 trainings, held by OEM, to increase my knowledge and skills with respect to assessments and retrofitting for earthquakes for houses (detached single family wood frame). I see myself as an educated advocate for Cascadia preparedness/risk-prevention and resiliency.

My main reason for writing you is I want to request that you please do not back down and water down the proposed mandates! I have seen the effects of poor infrastructure and poor planning in Ache and Haiti following earthquake events. Not only did buildings collapse and thousands of lives lost, but for YEARS after the events people lived in IDP camps (Internally Displaced Camps) because they had no wear to live. You may say well – “we are not a developing country and we will not be that impacted”, however our infrastructure, particularly our URM buildings, are NOT well developed. Further the recovery cost will be high regardless of what we do now, we should work now to reduce that impact. If we continue to do nothing, or attempt some “light fixes” such as proposed, that will give us a false sense of security and perhaps ultimately cost more money for both the retrofit as well as the clean up after it fails in an earthquake. It may also not protect lives, the entire purpose of retrofitting – thus giving URM building residents a false sense of security.

Those in opposition to the mandates are saying that this is all about a “land grab”, “displacement” and event yes “destruction”. It appears that in their eyes the earthquake is a far off fantasy that will not cause the very things they are fighting against. We know that it is not a fantasy based on the science. Further we don’t know enough about the faults that run through Portland and their frequency of going off, so the risk is in fact much higher when considering all earthquake risks. The 6.8 Nisqually earthquake that occurred in Washington in 2001 should also serve as a wakeup call for us. That earthquake caused 2-4 billion dollars (depending upon sources), most of which was to URM buildings. It was a relatively small earthquake.

The City needs take a leadership stance on this issue – for life and safety and long term sustainability of Oregon’s largest city. I think the policy should move forward as originally designed, not with the recent proposed amendments and even perhaps strengthened. If its implementation needs to be put off a year to refine (not delude it) that seems acceptable. Here are some of the things I think refinement should address:

- Yes prioritize schools and other facilities (class 1 and 2 in your proposal), but do not take off the table other buildings.
- Work to develop a matrix of the existing URM buildings and priority for retrofitting (among class 3 and 4 buildings). Not all are the same. Some should be replaced (e.g. the risk for failure is high, not historically significant or the ROI is not worth retrofitting). Priority should be placed on buildings’ that house people, particularly low-income and middle-income people with those buildings identified to be eligible for greater assistance for retrofitting or perhaps replacement as needed.
- Work to provide funding for low-income and maybe middle-income renters/owners (sliding scale?) that may be displaced during retrofitting and work to ensure that rehabilitated buildings rents remain the same, or similar, after retrofitting and that tenants have first rights to return (the HOPE VI tenant relocation program as well as other Home Forward renovation programs could serve as models for this).
- Yes we should work for affordable funding options for building owners that need additional resources to fix their buildings; however this should be done transparently. It is clear that some owners that are in opposition to this own multi-million dollar buildings with high rent tenants and appear to not want to pay the cost to rehabilitate. Some of these same owners, will be the first after the quake to ask FEMA and others for money to repair or tear down their building.

The government should not bear the burden of private owners who have the resources to fix their buildings, but choose not to. Yes it is unfortunate, but it's not the City's fault – the earthquake risk just is – placing blame to avoid responsibility is misdirected. When one owns real estate there are risks to owning and if owners are not prepared to deal with those risks when they arise perhaps they should not be owners. I know this sounds harsh – but it's a reality. That said I fully support affordable financing options, grants, etc, to support those that cannot pay and to lighten the load on those that can.

- The city (or via a contract) should consider hiring an ombudsman agent(s) who would retain all the necessary information on how to go about implementing the retrofits for building owners as a one-stop source of information to assist owners make sense of the paper work and associate processes and provide links to “certified” retrofitters. This would address some of the confusion URM building owners expressed at the Council meeting. A similar office (position) could be created for occupants of buildings, again the Home Forward model for HOPE VI and other rehabilitation projects could be useful here.
- It appears that the City may not have enforced (per testimony provided) its existing laws and this should be researched and corrected immediately, with systems put in place to ensure that such incidents do not occur again in the future.
- Fully support placarding buildings now to raise awareness, particularly of tenants of the risk to the buildings they live in. The City should extend this to all buildings, not just URMs. This will work to raise awareness and hopefully lead to people supporting more financing to fix OUR problem.

Questions the board should be considering in its decision making process:

- Who will be responsible for the cost of buildings that fail (for repairing or tearing down and debris removal) during a Cascadia event? If softening the mandate and kicking it down the road now does nothing – the cost will come eventually. Are we into prevention or are we into paying later?
- Who will be responsible for lives lost due to building failures?
- What is more important an old building or human lives?
- Should these decisions be based on science and evidence and good planning or emotions, fear and speculation?
- If you or a family member lived in an URM building – would you want it fixed now if you had a definitive date for the earthquake? Remember when Tahoku hit there was a 20% chance that it would happen at that time. We have the data on Cascadia – our risk is the same – we can't claim ignorance.

Thank you for your time. I hope that you will make the right decision on this matter!

From: Travis Pulley
To: [Commissioner Fish](#)
Cc: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Please keep our city safe with sensible policy Re: URM buildings
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 2:35:42 PM

Hello - I have lived in Portland for the past 25 years, graduated from Benson High School, attended Portland State University, and put a friend to rest at Willamette National Cemetery.

I ask you to consider the wisdom of policy tomorrow regarding our precious buildings. There are legitimate safety concerns, but there is also great danger in senseless policy that lacks a safety net for our history and community.

Ask yourselves if this in our cities best interest, or is it an opportunistic land grab.

Thank you for listening to me, and I appreciate your attention.

- Travis

From: andrea
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#)
Subject: please protect all of us
Date: Friday, June 8, 2018 10:42:41 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Council Members,

I'm a Portland resident and I volunteer for **Portland's Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET)** program. NETs are trained to deploy and render aid in the event of a disaster. Last year, NET volunteers contributed over 50,000 hours of volunteer time in service to Portland.

I'm emailing you today about the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) Council agenda item – scheduled as a Time Certain for June 13.

Scientists expect Portland will experience a major earthquake in the future; possibly in the very near future. **URMs will likely collapse when the ground shakes, harming occupants and persons in the streets nearby.** Portland has **more than 1,600** of these buildings.

I urge Council to take immediate action to require the seismic retrofits of these buildings before it is too late. The required standard must incorporate a level of retrofit that protects life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy.

As NETs, we're prepared to put their lives at risk following a quake to search for survivors. Each retrofitted URM is one less opportunity to put my life, and the lives of 1,700 of my fellow volunteers, at risk.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andrea Kowalski
6934 SE Yamhill St.
Portland, OR 97215

From: Bim Krumhansl
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Please require seismic retrofits for URM's now
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 1:02:44 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler,

I am emailing you today concerning the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) council agenda item, scheduled as a Time Certain for June 13.

I moved to Portland to pursue a career in commercial real estate, and to raise a family in the city where my wife grew up. Before moving here, I had heard a great deal about Portland's innovative city planning and urban development. Unfortunately, I have been quite disappointed. Portland's building code is not only outdated, it is unsafe. The system of exemptions in place to protect building owners who are "grandfathered" from critical life safety, seismic, and energy efficiency upgrades is incentivizing building owners to place their tenants' lives at risk and waste resources. This system of "grandfathered" exemptions creates an unfair advantage for URM building owners in particular, enabling them to play by a different set of rules and out-compete real estate investors who would do the right thing for their tenants' seismic safety. Passing a law to require mandatory seismic retrofit of URM's is just one of the many things that Portland needs to do to address its unfair, unsafe, and outdated building code and infrastructure.

Please do not delay the URM seismic retrofit mandate any further. The longer we wait, the more expensive seismic retrofits will become. Construction costs continue to rise year over year. The question of how to pay for these necessary retrofits must be left to URM owners themselves because each building will require a different strategy. It is not the city's responsibility to find a one-size-fits-all set of incentives to protect building owners' and tenants' profits. There are plenty of incentives already in place for building owners to convert buildings to their highest and best use. URM's are not only unsafe, they are also a drag on Portland's economy and a drain on the city's finances. The claim that mandatory seismic retrofits will hurt affordability is merely a scare tactic used by building owners to rally unknowing tenants and citizens to their side, and cause further delay. The solution to Portland's affordability issues is not to concentrate affordable real estate in unsafe buildings. Most URM building owners have not made any hard commitments to charging affordable rent. They charge less because their underutilized, inefficient, and unsafe space is worth less.

A Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake will occur. I expect it to occur within my lifetime. However, I am distraught to think that my family's love of Portland may also be our death sentence. Protection of the public safety is our government's most critical function and Portland has failed citizens by knowingly putting lives at risk to protect the wealth of URM building owners. Please stop this betrayal. The life and safety of Portland residents depends on your courage, vision and leadership. At the very least, the required retrofit standard must protect life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy. Furthermore, until these buildings are retrofitted I believe public placards must be posted at the entrances to these buildings. Portland residents have a right to know the risks they face when entering a URM building.

Respectfully, and with a great sense of urgency,
Robert Krumhansl

From: Glenn C. Devitt
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#)
Cc: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Please support URM retrofitting
Date: Saturday, June 9, 2018 5:39:57 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler and City Commissioners,

I write as a citizen of Portland, and volunteer NET Assistant Team Leader, to respectfully urge your support of the *entire* URM retrofitting proposal before the Council. I empathize with the opposing viewpoint about loss of profit to property owners. But what concerns me much more is loss of *life* by URM occupants. The extraordinary hazard posed by these structures also will affect me and my 1,700 fellow volunteer "first responders." After the inevitable CSZ earthquake we hope to comfort our neighbors, not pull bodies from piles of rubble.

I am hopeful that your concern for the lives of Portlanders will rationally overcome arguments in favor of short-term profit. The building standard must incorporate a level of retrofit that protects life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our great City.

Glenn C. Devitt
1320 SE 33rd Ave, 97214
503.345.4321

From: Stephanie Sandmeyer
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Cc: [URM Building Work Group](#)
Subject: Please vote no on Wednesday, June 13th regarding the retrofit mandate
Date: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:05:10 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners,

As an active community member (and one who voted for you and entrusted your thoughtful leadership in the care of our beautiful city and it's citizens), please consider your constituent's perspective before those of wealthy development firms. I have lived in Portland all of my life, and frankly, there has been more than enough demolition over the last decade. Change may be inevitable, but displacement, hardship and loss of the city's character does not have to be.

It is not that I am unconcerned about the safety of older URM buildings, or place greater value on human life than I do on preserving businesses or the cultural and historical significance of Portland's older buildings. It is that this mandate has no plan to avoid forced sales, demolitions, displacement, higher rents and the loss of Portland as we know it. There's a better way and that's to enforce the current code and add incentives. I ask you to table the class 3 and 4 buildings, tighten the code and remove the loopholes, enforce it and add incentives to give owners the support they need to complete phases of retrofits quicker. Notify every owner (hundreds of owners do not know) and give owners the ability to succeed.

My neighborhood is Clinton/Division street, which as you're likely aware, has become a different place than it was when I moved into it in 2005. I have been fortunate to have a landlord who has not taken advantage of the housing crisis in Portland by charging exorbitant rent, and have lived in the same apartment for the last 13 years. Thankfully, my building is not an URM. However, buildings that house small businesses in the neighborhood, which I frequent such as Division Wines, Atlas Pizza and Sovereign Tattoo at 3564-3574 SE Division St. are at risk for demolition. These buildings and businesses keep some of the character that has been lost in the construction of big, expensive (and ugly) condos, stores and restaurants up and down Division in recent years.

I know it's a difficult, multi-faceted decision. But I do think there are more options that need to be considered and explored that are better for everyone than this broad-sweeping mandate.

Yours in Portland's best interest,
Stephanie Sandmeyer

From: Rachel Bristol
To: [Michael Schilmoeller](mailto:Michael.Schilmoeller)
Cc: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Re: In Support of the URM Retrofitting Proposal
Date: Sunday, June 10, 2018 10:56:35 PM

Nice letter. R

Rachel Bristol
Rmbristoladvisors@gmail.com
503-230-9607
971-337-5084 (c)

On Jun 10, 2018, at 9:21 PM, Michael Schilmoeller <michaeljschilmoeller@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Wheeler:

I am a resident of Portland, and I volunteer for *Portland's Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET)* program. I am emailing you today concerning the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) Council agenda item, scheduled for June 13. I urge Council to take immediate action to require the seismic retrofits of these buildings. The required standard must incorporate a level of retrofit that protects life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy. In the meantime, signage and sidewalk safety awnings capable of withstanding failing walls should be required.

I appreciate that these retrofits will be expensive and may result in some owners being forced to tear down their buildings. I have several thoughts about this, however. First, my own family's investment in property was undertaken with recognition of the associated business risk. There could be environmental problems with the property about which no one knew when we bought the property. There is no question about who would bear the cost of mitigation. Investment always carries risk.

The second thought is that, if it were discovered that because of wiring problems or building materials these buildings were death traps for their inhabitants, we would not be having this debate. The argument that we should wait until after the earthquake to make the repairs, which I have seen in a letter opposed to these upgrades, is extremely callous in my opinion. We need to recognize that the only difference between these sources of risk is our familiarity with them.

Finally, if some means of mitigating the economic impact on building owners cannot be identified, it will represent a failure of imagination and creativity. We are internalizing the external cost of earthquake risk to the public by paying for retrofits. We can also internalize the external value of buildings we deem of architectural, aesthetic, or cultural significance through some kind of credit to the owners.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Schilmoeller

From: Kathy Rogers
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Dunphy, Jamie](#); [Schmanski, Sonia](#); [Perez, Elisabeth](#)
Subject: RE: Petition - Seismic Upgrades to Unreinforced Masonry (URM) Buildings in Portland, OR
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 8:44:55 AM

Dear City Commissioners – I wanted to again bring a petition regarding the URM Mandate to your attention. The following petition now has 2,280 signatures in support of the following recommendation:

We recommend that the mandate be limited to reinforcement of parapets, chimneys and cornices and attachment of the roof to the walls. This work can be done WITHOUT displacing tenants. We recommend that financing or financial incentives be provided so that property owners can afford to retrofit rather than demolish their buildings.

Below is a link to the Full Petition for your reference.

<https://www.change.org/p/kathy-rogers-petition-seismic-upgrades-to-unreinforced-masonry-urm-buildings-in-portland-or>

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathy Rogers
3815 SE Ankeny St, Portland, OR 97214

From: Angie Even
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Re: URM's - July 13 City Council Meeting
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 1:46:49 PM

My apologies. I had a error.

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners.

Respectfully, I'd like to offer the following thoughts ahead of the City Council vote on June 13th.

For twenty-two months, I have observed this process. I first was alarmed in August of 2016 when I received a generic postcard inviting me to an "informational meeting" in which I attended and could not get any information. Instead, I observed dozens of people asking questions without any answers, not in defiance, but because the city and the policy committee didn't have any.

Since that date, I have attended every meeting, read every material dated back to 2014. I've met with hundreds of people. Met with dozens of neighborhood and business groups, most of you, historic preservation staff and fellow building owners. All of this in the quest for answers to questions and solutions to problems.

Here we are and there has been no resolve. The questions remain unanswered and the problems are not solved.

I believe the decision before you is the most consequential decision faced in the 58 years I've been in Portland. There has never been a decision that will negatively impact thousands of residents, thousands of tenants, thousands of small businesses and thousands of non-profits. Thousands.

Every process is valuable. Valuable in that it informs us in actions that are responsible and those that are not. We all agree that safety is responsible. We all agree that working toward upgrades is responsible. We all agree that the stewards of these buildings need a path forward that sets them up for success.

Today that path has hit the fork. Each of you have a decision to make.

Is the right path to take to advance a mandate that has more problems than solutions or is the path we should be taking is to advance the schools, critical buildings and city-owned buildings while creating a city-wide educational plan, resiliency plan, a plan for gas shut-off valves, fuel tanks, other infrastructure and the over 100,000 single-family homes that are not retrofitted.

The owners of these buildings can see outside ourselves. We understand that if we fail, we fail our families and our tenants and those who depend on us. As owners, we cannot fail unless the city fails us.

I ask you to table the class 3 and 4 buildings, tighten the code and remove the loopholes, enforce it and add incentives to give owners the support they need to complete phases of retrofits quicker. Notify every owner (hundreds of owners do not know) and give owners the

ability to succeed.

In my months of talking to the community, one thing I can pass on to you today. A message of nurturing affordable housing and small business rent, concern of displacement, demolition and erasing Portland as we know it will be heard far and wide over Portland that our Mayor and City Council care. That does not diminish the message of safety or care for our city, quite contrary as we can have both if we work together and find that path for success for everyone.

Angie Even
4410 SE Woodstock

On Thu, Jun 7, 2018 at 1:14 PM, Angie Even <justmeng@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners.

Respectfully, I'd like to offer the following thoughts ahead of the City Council vote on June 13th.

For twenty-two months, I have observed this process. I first was alarmed in August of 2016 when I received a generic postcard inviting me to an "informational meeting" in which I attended and could not get any information. Instead, I observed dozens of people asking questions without any answers, not in defiance, but because the city and the policy committee didn't have any.

Since that date, I have attended every meeting, read every material dated back to 2014. I've met with hundreds of people. Met with dozens of neighborhood and business groups, most of you, historic preservation staff and fellow building owners. All of this in the quest for answers to questions and solutions to problems.

Here we are and there has been no resolve. The questions remain unanswered and the problems are not solved.

I believe the decision before you is the most consequential decision faced in the 58 years I've been in Portland. There has never been a decision that will negatively impact thousands of residents, thousands of tenants, thousands of small businesses and thousands of non-profits. Thousands.

Every process is valuable. Valuable in that it informs us in actions that are responsible and those that are not. We all agree that safety is responsible. We all agree that working toward upgrades is responsible. We all agree that the stewards of these buildings need a path forward that sets them up for success.

Today that path has hit the fork. Each of you have a decision to make.

Is the right path to take to advance a mandate that has more problems than solutions or is the path we should be taking is to advance the schools, critical buildings and city-owned buildings while creating a city-wide educational plan, resiliency plan, a plan for gas shut-off valves, fuel tanks, other infrastructure and the over 100,000 single-family homes that are not retrofitted.

The owners of these buildings can see outside ourselves. We understand that if we fail, we

fail our families and our tenants and those who depend on us. As owners, we cannot fail unless the city fails us.

I ask you to table the class 3 and 4 buildings, tighten the code and remove the loopholes, enforce it and add incentives to give owners the support they need to complete phases of retrofits quicker. Notify every owner (hundreds of owners do not know) and give owners the ability to succeed.

In my months of talking to the community, one thing I can pass on to you today. A message of nurturing of affordable housing and small business rent, concern of displacement, demolition and erasing Portland as we know it will be heard far and wide over Portland that our Mayor and City Council. That does not diminish the message of safety or care for our city, quite contrary as we can have both if we work together and find that path for success for everyone.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Angie Even
4410 SE Woodstock

From: Dan T
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Save Portland Buildings - Vote NO on the mandate.
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 12:21:42 PM

Hello,

I am writing you today to urge you to vote **NO** on the mandate for updating buildings in Portland.

I am a resident of this great city and have been for over 20 years. Before that, I lived in Vancouver, WA across the river. My family and I would love coming downtown to be around the unique sights of the city. I moved to live here on the west side as soon as I could leave high school. I've since lived in every quadrant of the city, from NW to SW, NE to SE. No matter where I was in the city - whether off the bustling streets of NW 21st to the lazy neighborhoods of Hawthorne - every place I've lived felt like home. This is because I lived, worked, breathed and loved among the beauty of this great city.

I have seen the list and pictures of the over 1700 buildings that may be affected by this mandate and am appalled at the idea that any one of them could disappear after the June 13th vote.

The landscape of Portland is made up of these great buildings and structures. They exist not just as the backdrop for our lives but are very much a part of the life blood of this great metropolis.

Forcing tenants to cover 100% of the costs for these grossly unnecessary renovations could result in the closing of some of Portland's most iconic storefronts, bars & restaurants, and residences. It would be a outright travesty to lose the essential parts of the city that make *Portland Portland*.

Already, our great city has changed. And, while I welcome new residents and new businesses into our home, to vote yes on this mandate would threaten to make Portland completely unrecognizable. This city deserves better than that.

Please, please, *please* consider a firm NO vote on this mandate and help Keep Portland *Portland*.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Dan Tabayoyon
622 SE 47th Ave
Portland, OR 97215

From: Mary Ellen
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Seismic Retrofits on URMs
Date: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 3:43:09 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler:

I am a resident of Portland, and I volunteer for Portland's Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET) program. NETs are trained to deploy and render aid in the event of a disaster. Last year, NET volunteers contributed over 50,000 hours of volunteer time in service to Portland.

I am emailing you today concerning the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) Council agenda item, scheduled as a Time Certain for June 13. As you know, scientists expect Portland will experience a major earthquake in the future; possibly in the very near future. URMs will likely collapse when the ground shakes, harming occupants and persons in the streets nearby. Portland has over 1,600 of these buildings.

I urge Council to take immediate action to require the seismic retrofits of these buildings before it is too late. The required standard must incorporate a level of retrofit that protects life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy.

NET volunteers will put their lives at risk following a quake to search for survivors. Each retrofitted URM is one less opportunity to put my life, and the lives of 1,700 of my fellow volunteers, at risk.

I realize that the cost to retrofit for the URM owners could be passed on to renters in those buildings or customers of businesses in those cases. I hope you can find some way for the city, state and/or federal government to provide assistance to URM owners in making the retrofits so the cost of housing does not increase unnecessarily.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,
Mary Ellen Grace
NET member, Mt Tabor

From: Leather Flower
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Stick to current code
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 5:46:52 PM

No Mandate! No Demolitions! No Displacements! No Higher Rents!
Our beautiful City does not need another man made housing crisis.

Sent from my iPhone

From: T. M.
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Strongly urging you to reconsider Seismic Retrofitting/URM Mandate
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 4:09:47 PM

Mayor Ted Wheeler

RE: Seismic Retrofitting/URM Mandate

Dear Mayor Wheeler:

As a lifelong resident of the City of Portland, I am one of many—as part of families and other organizations—who are working to save the historic buildings that represent the heart and soul of this special place that we all call home. I am asking you as a government official working for the good of our community to slow down, to listen and to work with residents to save the historic buildings that give Portland its unique character—before it is too late.

The City of Portland published a list of 1,640 buildings on May 2, 2016. The City now plans to mandate seismic retrofits for 1,640 unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings at an estimated cost of \$1.4 billion.

Many owners of these buildings do not know that they are on this list or what is coming. These small buildings (81% are 1-2 story) each face hundreds of thousands of dollars in unaffordable costs. Many structures will not be feasible to retrofit and individuals, families, residents, small businesses, and communities will lose their homes, businesses and buildings.

Each edifice is in *full code compliance*. The proposed mandate changes all of that. Seismic retrofit costs exceed the dollar value of many of these structures. There is no safety net for owners or the people who depend upon them for places to live and work.

A mandate without a safety net or plan will force demolitions, bankruptcies and displacements that will forever change the landscape and character of Portland.

There is no plan:

No plan for 7,000 units (1,800 low-income housing).

No plan to financially assist tenants when displaced.

No plan for small business displacement or job loss.

No plan for increased rents and lack of affordable rents.

No plan for how 1,640 buildings will afford \$1.4 billion in retrofit costs.

No plan to avoid displacements, demolitions and bankruptcies.

And what about schools?

Certainly one must fully support prioritizing schools and critical buildings for seismic protection. Today, only 4% of Portland Public Schools are fully retrofitted. On Nov. 8, 2017, a Portland Public Schools representative warned the City that mandating the seismic upgrade of private buildings will work against goals to retrofit schools by making it more difficult and costly. In Salem, the State of Oregon voted against \$337 million in retrofits for the State Capitol in order to prioritize Oregon's schools. In contrast, the City of Portland is proposing a tax abatement (SB-311) for private building owners. That abatement would take revenue from

PortlandSchools and/or the State School Fund at a time when school funds are depleted. It seems reasonable that public funds should be prioritized to update and fund the schools, instead of being funneled to mitigate problems created by a mandate with no real plan of implementation or costs-benefits analysis. Ken Rust, Chief Financial Officer for Portland has said that "If SB 311 is enacted, public schools would experience property tax revenue loss." We all care about safety. We also care about the thousands of residents and small businesses that will be displaced. We care that the policy under consideration revokes the relocation fee for residents and that the funding proposed will defund our schools.

The current code includes everything that is being proposed in the mandate. The mandate has been developed to accelerate the code. Building owners who cannot afford the retrofit costs have been told by the City that they will either have to sell or demolish their buildings.

Who stands to benefit from this? The mandate adds untenable timelines, conditions and fines that will force many buildings into fire sales and demolitions that will only benefit wealthy developers who desire the complete and irreversible reconstruction of the City and the vast fortune that it represents to them. Consequences for the little guy are less rosy. They include mass displacement of tenants during a period that the Mayor's office has repeatedly called an ongoing "housing crisis."

The greatest loss will be to the City of Portland itself. It will forever lose its unique character. It will lose its affordability and enviable quality of life. It will lose its sky as large boxy structures replace all of its existing housing stock. It will lose its sidewalks and rights of way to more and more homelessness as people are turned out of their affordable housing, their buildings and their places to work. It will become just another generic crime-ridden West Coast city like Seattle and Vancouver, BC have become under the same development pressures mounted by special interests. Portland's destruction will be funded by the same development money, in the same ways, using the same blueprints—to the exact same result. Portland and Salem governance will lose credibility and public trust as it becomes ever more obvious who is pulling the strings and who is benefiting whom as our communities collapse and die absent any public process worthy of the name. Ramming through RIP and URM will unleash a whirlwind of negative public opinion and lawsuits, and will end careers—some before they even begin.

Think on these things before acting rashly.

You can still save the City of Portland. And it's simple to do.

It is reasonable to request the City of Portland to update **Title 24.85 of the Code** in order to develop an equitable plan with incentives and a path to success. The displacement and financial loss to the community by indiscriminate demolition of our beloved buildings will change Portland into a generic wasteland of garden-variety architecture where only the developer is king. It is a reasonable approach to address each building individually and to abandon this broad-brushed mandate that has no plan, funding or implementation.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Todd Miller

Rose City Park
Portland OR

From: Kathy Reese
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Supporting URM Retrofitting
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 11:38:22 AM

Dear Mayor Wheeler:

My name is Kathy Reese and I have been a Portland resident my entire life. For the past 17 years, I have lived in the Parkrose neighborhood. I am a very active member of the Portland Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET), currently serving as the Team Leader for the Argay-Parkrose-Parkrose Heights-Russell- Wilkes team.

I attended the Unreinforced Masonry Buildings (URM) hearing at City Hall. Experts, as well as building owners and citizens shared so much great information.

I want to voice my opinion that URMs must be retrofitted sooner than later. These buildings pose a very real danger to anyone near them, should an earthquake strike. Ceilings, walls and floors will be subject to separation. Exterior parapets will be subject to falling from their mountings. Bricks will be subject to falling from the exterior of these buildings. This will not only injure (or kill) those inside, but can also injure or kill anyone walking or driving along the street when the building comes apart. This happened in Christchurch, New Zealand with the rubble landing on a city bus killing all but one rider.

This link is to a video from New Zealand. It shows the collapse of a URM in Christchurch. [Christchurch, New Zealand Quake Damage](#)

We cannot wait 10-15-20 years for retrofits to be completed. We do not wait that long for other safety updates. I realize that this will be expensive and that some building owners may not have the funds to complete retrofits. Perhaps there is a way to provide low-cost loans for such work to be done.

I encourage City Council to take action on URMs to protect the citizens and visitors to our great city.

Thank you!

--

Kathy Reese

Argay-Parkrose NET - Team Leader

503-419-8033

[Argay-Parkrose NET on Facebook](#)

[Portland Prepares - Argay-Parkrose](#)

From: Brian Allen
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [URM Building Work Group](#)
Cc: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#); [Joan Tate Allen](#)
Subject: Unreinforced Masonry Building Retrofit Mandate
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 1:27:47 PM

TO: Mayor Ted Wheeler
Commissioner Chloe Eudaly
Commissioner Dan Saltzman
Commissioner Nick Fish
Commissioner Amanda Fritz

RE: URM building retrofit mandate

Over many years I have had the honor and pleasure of meeting most of you and sometimes working towards the same goals on a number of important community initiatives.

Today, I am writing to I encourage you to vote no on the proposed URM building mandate.

I think a no vote is right for the city, but I also have a real stake in the outcome of this vote. Perhaps my personal story may help explain my reasons for encouraging a no vote.

I am a member of an LLC that owns 733 NW 20th Ave., Portland OR 97209, a building designated to be impacted by the proposed USM mandate.

Our building is over 10,000 square feet, and was originally a brick colonial residence. It has been used as an office building for about 35 years now.

The proposed requirements would essentially make our building functionally obsolete.

I have heard rough estimates of up to \$110 per square foot to make the URM mandated retrofit changes to a building like ours. With over 10,000 square feet in the building that might cost \$1,100,000.

My experience with making major changes to buildings of this size and age is that the actual finished cost is significantly higher than original estimates. It is rare for a contractor to make a firm bid on a project of this nature. Instead, due to the irregularities of working on an old historical property, the bid is a formula based on actual time and materials used plus an oversite percentage and a margin percentage for profit. This results in a potentially huge cost.

Even if the cost can realistically be limited to \$1,100,000, the partnership that owns the

property does not have that money.

We purchased the building 3.5 years ago for \$2,800,000, and currently have a bit over \$2,250,000 remaining debt from the purchase of the property. The partnership does not have the necessary funds to pay for the URM mandated work. No bank would be willing to lend an additional \$1,100,000 because there would not be sufficient equity to debt ratio to justify the loan.

And, the banks debt to equity ratio is based on today's current market values. We face the very real possibility that the real market value of our property and every other property designated by the URM proposal will go down in value in an amount equal to the cost of compliance if the proposal is passed into law.

Shortly after closing on the purchase of the building we made major improvements to the interior of the building which cost several hundred thousand dollars. If we are forced to do the URM mandated work much of that work will be disrupted and will need to be done again resulting in an enormous waste of our time and money.

If the proposal passes we will be forced into a very compromising situation. We can't justify the cost of the required work from a business perspective. Because, there is no way to recover the cost of making the URM improvements, either from increase rent, or increased sales price. We can't afford to do the required work based on the current cash flow from the building. In fact, the LLC could not even afford to pay the fines proposed if we fail to do the work.

The building is currently leased to a tenant. Because the required work would likely render the building uninhabitable during construction the tenant would be displaced and suffer economic losses, for which we might be liable due to the terms of our lease. Construction time may run between 6 to 12 months. We would likely lose the tenant who cannot afford to be out of business during the construction time.

If we lose the income from the tenant, we lose the ability to service the debt on the building.

If the mandate passes, our options are all bleak.

Option One: We do the work. We provide some financial compensation to the tenant to mitigate the consequences of the disruption. The costs will never be recovered in the property value or increase rents. It is a simple forced taking of our money by local government.

Option Two: We do the work. But, in the process we lose the tenant. We lose the ability to service the debt. We run the risk of falling behind on debt payments and/or contractor

payments, and the bank and/or contractor foreclose. We lose all equity in the building.

Option Three: We can't afford to do the required work. We can't afford to pay the fines. We are forced into litigation with the City.

Option Four: We can't afford to do the work. We can't afford to pay the fines. The LLC declares bankruptcy to protect assets.

Option Four: Instead of facing any of the dire and risky options above, and instead of spending \$1 million dollars which we will never recover, we tear the building down and build a new multi-story apartment building on the site. Sadly, this last option becomes the only economically viable option.

Please vote no.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Brian Allen
Managing Member 733 LLC

President
Windermere Realty Trust
733 NW 20th Ave.
Portland, OR 97209
503-220-1144

From: Theodora Tsongas
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs)
Date: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 11:09:07 AM

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Portland City Council Members,

I am a resident of Portland and an environmental health scientist/epidemiologist. Portland's 1,700 *Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET)* volunteers are trained to deploy and render aid in the event of a disaster. Last year, NET volunteers contributed over 50,000 hours of volunteer time in service to Portland. They generously give many hours of their lives for training and service and are a vital asset to our community.

I am contacting you today concerning the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) Council agenda item, scheduled for June 13. As you know, scientists expect Portland will experience a major earthquake, possibly in the very near future. URMs are very likely to collapse when the ground shakes, harming occupants and persons in the streets nearby. Portland has over 1,600 of these buildings. NET volunteers will put their lives at risk following a quake to search for survivors.

I urge Council to take immediate action to require the seismic retrofits of these buildings before it is too late. The required standard must incorporate a level of retrofit that protects life safety, and wall-to-floor attachments must be included in the policy.

Each retrofitted URM is one less opportunity to put the lives of portlanders and visitors as well as dedicated volunteers at risk.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Theodora Tsongas, PhD, MS

From: CHARLES ROSSMAN
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Unreinforced Masonry Buildings
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 5:11:38 PM

Honored Commissioners:

I am very concerned that in the event of a major earthquake, that large numbers of unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) will rain down thousands of tons of bricks on an unsuspecting populous. If it is possible for government to enforce laws that require individuals to use seat belts for their own protection, or not to use their cell phones while driving, or even to wear a helmet while riding a bicycle, then why not ask building owners to save lives by retrofitting URMs?

I understand that there may be a large financial burden associated with this type of retrofit, but how much is a human life worth? I am not saying that this **MUST** be done today, this month, or even this year, but that you should push for a reasonable timeline for its completion.

In the February 2011 earthquake on Christchurch New Zealand, 40 people lost their lives due to URMs.



(8 people died on the Red Bus #702)

While that quake only lasted for approximately 10 seconds, a Cascadia Subduction earthquake will last for something like four or five minutes.

While Christchurch's URMs were mostly two story buildings, many in Portland are even taller and therefore even more dangerous.

As you know, there are approximately 1,650 of these structures throughout our city. As a *Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET)* volunteer I would rather not be called out to dig through piles of bricks and mortar for the dead and dying. As I know you don't want to see that, or have that happen to our fair city.

Please take the time to think about and implement a sound URM policy.

Thank you very much!

Charles W. Rossman

From: Hollis Blanchard
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: unreinforced masonry regulations
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 8:39:14 PM

Mayor Wheeler, I'm really concerned about the weak unreinforced masonry regulations being considered for Portland.

We know a large earthquake will affect Portland. We know that when it happens, URM buildings will hurt and kill anyone in or near them. That includes people who don't get to choose: their jobs are there, or their apartment is there, or they were walking by on the sidewalk, or (most disturbingly) they are legally required to go to school there.

I volunteer a significant amount of my time as a team leader for my Neighborhood Emergency Team to help my neighbors in the event of a disaster. There are many URM buildings in my neighborhood; however, my team and I will not be able to help the people affected by their collapse. We won't be able to go into the building, even if part of it is still standing. We won't be able to help any survivors trapped under the weight of the rubble. We don't have the heavy equipment or skills, and the risk of aftershocks and unstable debris is too great. That, more than anything else I've learned about the NET program, is really troubling.

I know it's a complicated issue, and the money needed to mitigate this risk doesn't just magically appear. I don't have an answer for that. However, adopting half-measures would be the worst of both worlds: require money and disruption now, and yet still not save lives later.

I strongly urge you to adopt standard life-safety retrofit standards for these buildings.

Please, and thank you.

-Hollis

From: beth
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Cc: [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Upcoming URM agenda item
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 2:54:49 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler:

I have lived in Portland for over twenty years, and I remember well when the Nisqually quake occurred. I visited Seattle a few months afterward and the damage caused to the brick buildings in old town Seattle was memorable and sobering.

With this in mind I am contacting you about the unreinforced masonry buildings (URMs) Council agenda item, which will be addressed June 13th. As you know, we are expecting a quake significantly stronger than the Nisqually quake, and we must have seismic retrofits of Portland's URMS before that happens.

I am concerned for personal reasons: I volunteer for Portland's Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET) program. I am prepared to put my life at some risk following a quake to search for survivors, and every retrofitted URM may save both myself and my neighbors from injury or worse.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beth Heins, Woodlawn neighborhood

From: Ernest Jones
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony; Wheeler, Mayor](#)
Subject: URM Feedback
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 10:22:35 AM

Greetings,

I'm writing to let you know that I feel strongly that the Portland City Council should approve the recommendations put forth by the Bureau of Emergency Management regarding the un-reinforced masonry proposal. Portland will loose too many lives if these measures are not put in place sooner rather than later.

Thank you for considering this.

Respectfully,

Ernest Jones
1015 NE Webster St.
Portland, OR 97211

Phone: 503-493-0001

From: Tim Even
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM Mandate - Tenants will be the one who pay.
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 12:41:18 PM

Mayor Wheeler and Council members

Please Stop the URM Mandate!

This mandate will cause higher rents, more homeless people, demolition of Portland's main street buildings and will put a blight on the city.

At the May 9th Council meeting only the pro-mandate members of the URM policy committee were allowed to present. Why was this when the URM policy committee did not come to a consensus?

The cost numbers that were presented were false.

The funding is mythical and picks winners and losers:

SB-311 is inequitable as the same building on NW 23rd would get 3 to 4 times the tax abatement as an identical building on SE Foster Rd. The retrofit costs would be the same.

How is this fair?

The CPACE loan favors the rich as well. If you have a mortgage, your bank would have to agree to take second position. That's not going to happen so the only owners who might be able to use this would be the ones without a mortgage. It also it can't be used by condo owners.

This is a poor plan and if passed will doom Portland's buildings to disrepair and blight.

Please put the other buildings in the code, improve it, actually enforce it and add incentives.

Retrofitting the schools, critical and city-owned buildings, especially low-income housing is doing something without advancing the man-made disaster called the URM Mandate.

Who will pay?

In a city plagued with a housing crisis and affordable rent crisis, tenants will be the losers in this.

Respectfully,

Tim Even
4410 SE Woodstock

From: Jim Wilson
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM seismic policy
Date: Sunday, June 10, 2018 10:20:44 PM

Hello Mayor Wheeler and commissioners,

I have been watching and studying the URM issue since April of last year.

It seems that the URM policy committee recommendation in the only actual vote taken (Oct. 3) the consensus was for the roof to walls option and did not include the more expensive floors to walls upgrades. A number of committee members have come forward and expressed this. The majority on the committee stated that without meaningful funding in place there should be no mandate.

Had it not been for the city's policy of selling roof permits to roofing contractors in "bundles" of five more URM buildings would already have the seismic upgrades per the current code (24.85). It is the city's lack of enforcement of the current code that has resulted in Portland not being safer regarding earthquakes. It is disturbing that the city's (PBEM) message to the mom and pop owners is that if they cannot afford whatever upgrades are deemed necessary that they should sell or demolish their buildings. If earthquake safety is such a high priority why is it that the city in the last 20+ years since the current code was adopted not protected the people of Portland by completing the seismic work on their buildings (schools, emergency buildings, affordable housing, etc.)?

Currently there is no meaningful funding for assisting building owners with expensive upgrades. The federal government, the state and the city have considered how this could be done for 20+ years now and have not even upgraded the schools, which would seem to be the first priority. No number of committees, study groups, etc. is going to accomplish this in the near future. The longer we procrastinate the less safe we are.

If anything other than closing the loopholes in the current code is adopted, seismic upgrades in the private sector will not occur to any meaningful degree. Many buildings will be demolished in the interim and/or blight will occur. These buildings offer the most affordable rents and business lease rates in the city. Many residents and businesses will be displaced with only more expensive housing and commercial space as their likely option. Given that 85% of these buildings are commercial in nature this will be devastating to the economic vitality of the city and the makeup of neighborhoods and business districts. Many people testified at the last council meeting as to the devastating consequences that will result if the city adopts a policy that does not help owners to succeed.

This is not an either/or situation. If moms and pops are helped to succeed by employing the current code buildings will be upgraded over time. These buildings can be saved AND be made more safe if the city is committed to it.

There are a number of other ways to make the city safer such as protecting gas lines, investing in an early warning system, educating the public about what to do in an earthquake, developing safe rooms, utilizing new technology to upgrade buildings other than the methods put forth by the city engineers, etc.

It is interesting that many of the new construction buildings around the city being built have substantial brick facades and even cornices on them.

I urge you to proceed with Class 1 and 2 buildings immediately and to close the loopholes in the current code (24.85) and give owners of Class 3 and 4 buildings 20 - 30 years to comply. Private owners should not be asked to do more than what the city, to date, has not done in upgrading its own portfolio.

Of the amendments proposed at the last city council meeting I believe that Nick Fish's are the most pragmatic and offer the best chance for success.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Wilson

843 N Knott

Portland, OR

From: Anne Castleton
To: [Wheeler, Mayor; Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM testimony: please protect the people of Portland
Date: Monday, June 11, 2018 9:46:48 PM

Testimony for the City Council June 13 Meeting

Dear Ted,

As one of your constituents, I am writing to voice my support for the retrofitting recommendations of the URM Policy Committee introduced by PBEM at the May 9 Council meeting and as amended by Mayor Wheeler at that meeting.

Protecting the lives of Portland area residents when a major earthquake strikes demands that we take action to shore up buildings constructed before the dangers of great Cascadia subduction zone earthquakes were understood. We now know that there is a 14-20% chance of a magnitude 9+ Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) earthquake in the next 50 years. Financial assistance programs are crucial to encourage URM building owners to accomplish the seismic retrofits essential to saving lives, preserving affordable housing options, and enhancing Portland's capacity to recover from a CSZ earthquake. Together, we all must be willing to invest our resources toward accomplishing these societal goals.

The original resolution drafted by PBEM for the May 9 meeting, and as amended at that meeting by the Mayor, provides the most practical framework to achieve these goals. The necessity of retrofitting to save lives was compellingly supported in the opening testimony at the May 9 Council meeting and in the City Club research report. I think that further work is necessary to map out the financing of retrofitting the URMs under consideration. Once the financing incentives have been developed the Council should insist on a stronger retrofit policy that includes tying walls to floors as recommended by PBEM.

The four year URM study undertaken by PBEM was an excellent example of multi-stakeholder citizen engagement aimed at complex policy development, and I supported the original proposal presented to Council on May 9. However, after subsequent consideration of the Mayor's amendment, I agree that additional work is needed to ensure that good financing options are available to building owners, so that URM building stock can be maintained as Portland faces a worsening housing supply crunch. About 6,000 units of residential housing are in URMs, including about 1,800 publicly-financed affordable units.

Further, I hope that council adopt the recommendation on mandatory placarding in the strongest possible terms. It will still be many years before URM buildings in

Portland have been retrofitted, and an obligation exists to inform the people who live and work in those spaces of the risks. Going forward no one should buy a condominium or rent an apartment or commercial space in Portland without knowing their prospective home or work space has potentially disruptive and costly work that needs to be done on it, and that they would be spending time in a building that's known to be unsafe.

Thank you,

Anne Castleton

6823 SE Woodstock Blvd.

Portland, 97206

From: Rob F
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Cc: [City Club Earthquake Resiliency Advocacy Committee](#)
Subject: URM testimony: Protecting the People of Portland
Date: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 12:01:42 PM

To Portland City Council Commissioners:

From: Tom Dyke, Rob Fullmer, Kevin Glenn

City Club Earthquake Resilience Advocacy Committee

Testimony for the City Council June 13 Meeting

On behalf of the 2000 members of the City Club of Portland, we are writing to voice our support for the retrofitting recommendations of the URM Policy Committee introduced by PBEM at the May 9 Council meeting and as amended by Mayor Wheeler at that meeting.

Protecting the lives of Portland area residents when a major earthquake strikes demands that we take action to shore up buildings constructed before the dangers of great Cascadia subduction zone earthquakes were understood. We now know that there is a 14-20% chance of a magnitude 9+ Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) earthquake in the next 50 years. Financial assistance programs are crucial to encourage URM building owners to accomplish the seismic retrofits essential to saving lives, preserving affordable housing options, and enhancing Portland's capacity to recover from a CSZ earthquake. Together, we all must be willing to invest our resources toward accomplishing these societal goals.

The original resolution drafted by PBEM for the May 9 meeting, and as amended at that meeting by the Mayor, provides the most practical framework to achieve these goals. The necessity of retrofitting to save lives was compellingly supported in the opening testimony at the May 9 Council meeting and in the City Club research report. We agree that further work is necessary to map out the financing of retrofitting the URMs under consideration. The four year URM study undertaken by PBEM was an excellent example of multi-stakeholder citizen engagement aimed at complex policy development, and we supported the original proposal presented to Council on May 9. However, after subsequent consideration of the Mayor's amendment, we agree that additional work is needed to ensure that good financing options are available to building owners, so that URM building stock can be maintained as Portland faces a worsening housing supply crunch. About 6,000 units of residential housing are in URMs, including about 1,800 publicly-financed affordable units.

Further, we recommend that council adopt the recommendation on mandatory placarding in the strongest possible terms. It will still be many years before URM buildings in Portland have been retrofitted, and an obligation exists to inform the

people who live and work in those spaces of the risks. Going forward no one should buy a condominium or rent an apartment or commercial space in Portland without knowing their prospective home or work space has potentially disruptive and costly work that needs to be done on it, and that they would be spending time in a building that's known to be unsafe.

In the spring of 2016, the City Club of Portland appointed a committee of its members to study earthquake resilience in Portland and the surrounding metro region. Over a nine month period, this Research Committee interviewed over 80 scientists, engineers, building owners, and government officials. The Committee also reviewed over 100 scholarly articles and scientific reports, policy papers, legislation, and popular articles. The resulting report "*Big Steps Before the Big One: How the Portland area can bounce back after a major earthquake*" and its recommendations were approved in February of 2017 by a 98% yes vote by the membership of City Club [<http://www.pdxcityclub.org/earthquake>].

The Research Committee recommended that Portland adopt the mandatory URM retrofit policy then being developed by City-led committees, and that a range of incentives to assist property owners in retrofitting should be developed through a multi-stakeholder process. One such incentive recommended by the Research Committee is that the State of Oregon allow local governments to grant property tax exemptions to offset retrofitting costs for seismic improvement. This policy was passed into law as SB 311 by the Oregon Legislature in 2017.

City Club's Earthquake Resilience Advocacy Committee was formed in the spring of 2017 to work toward enacting these two recommendations, along with twelve others, that were approved by City Club members. We believe that the current URM proposal before City Council, as amended by Mayor Wheeler, is the most practical way to implement the heart of the City Club's recommendation for URM retrofitting.

The City Club of Portland and its 2,000 members support the passage of the mandatory URM retrofitting policy before the Council at its June 13 meeting. We also support the amendment by Mayor Wheeler to form a multi-stakeholder group to better understand and facilitate the development of financial incentives necessary to achieve seismic retrofitting essential to enhance the safety of URMs in Portland.

Thank you,
The City Club Earthquake Resilience Advocacy Committee

From: TERESA MCGRATH
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony; Wheeler, Mayor; Commissioner Fritz; Commissioner Fish; Commissioner Saltzman; Commissioner Fudaly](#)
Subject: urm tomorrow
Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 11:26:19 AM

to the mayor and cc,

<https://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/398142-292400-quake-expert-portland-needs-to-shake-up-seismic-retrofits>

fear mongering never accomplishes anything but more distrust.....

goldfinger is a celebrity, enough said....

per goldfinger, "The opposition to it by some very well organized building owners was very strong, which was surprising."

surprising?

essentially this mandate will displace more marginal people, bankrupt building owners, and is a poor plan...

a 9.0 quake, will level portland no matter what you do to secure your building...

this is a waste of \$, and isn't good for the city nor the budget...

please toss it out...

we will be attending tomorrow morning....

thx

teresa mcgrath and nat kim

3344 ne 15 97212/442 ne sumner 97211

From: Angie Even
To: [Wheeler, Mayor](#); [Commissioner Fish](#); [Commissioner Fritz](#); [Commissioner Saltzman](#); [Commissioner Eudaly](#); [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: URM's - July 13 City Council Meeting
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 1:15:36 PM

Dear Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners.

Respectfully, I'd like to offer the following thoughts ahead of the City Council vote on June 13th.

For twenty-two months, I have observed this process. I first was alarmed in August of 2016 when I received a generic postcard inviting me to an "informational meeting" in which I attended and could not get any information. Instead, I observed dozens of people asking questions without any answers, not in defiance, but because the city and the policy committee didn't have any.

Since that date, I have attended every meeting, read every material dated back to 2014. I've met with hundreds of people. Met with dozens of neighborhood and business groups, most of you, historic preservation staff and fellow building owners. All of this in the quest for answers to questions and solutions to problems.

Here we are and there has been no resolve. The questions remain unanswered and the problems are not solved.

I believe the decision before you is the most consequential decision faced in the 58 years I've been in Portland. There has never been a decision that will negatively impact thousands of residents, thousands of tenants, thousands of small businesses and thousands of non-profits. Thousands.

Every process is valuable. Valuable in that it informs us in actions that are responsible and those that are not. We all agree that safety is responsible. We all agree that working toward upgrades is responsible. We all agree that the stewards of these buildings need a path forward that sets them up for success.

Today that path has hit the fork. Each of you have a decision to make.

Is the right path to take to advance a mandate that has more problems than solutions or is the path we should be taking is to advance the schools, critical buildings and city-owned buildings while creating a city-wide educational plan, resiliency plan, a plan for gas shut-off valves, fuel tanks, other infrastructure and the over 100,000 single-family homes that are not retrofitted.

The owners of these buildings can see outside ourselves. We understand that if we fail, we fail our families and our tenants and those who depend on us. As owners, we cannot fail unless the city fails us.

I ask you to table the class 3 and 4 buildings, tighten the code and remove the loopholes, enforce it and add incentives to give owners the support they need to complete phases of retrofits quicker. Notify every owner (hundreds of owners do not know) and give owners the ability to succeed.

In my months of talking to the community, one thing I can pass on to you today. A message of nurturing of affordable housing and small business rent, concern of displacement, demolition and erasing Portland as we know it will be heard far and wide over Portland that our Mayor and City Council. That does not diminish the message of safety or care for our city, quite contrary as we can have both if we work together and find that path for success for everyone.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Angie Even
4410 SE Woodstock

From: Shelby Kray
To: [Council Clerk – Testimony](#)
Subject: Vote NO on the mandate
Date: Thursday, June 7, 2018 12:30:19 PM

As a citizen of Portland, I'm urging that you do NOT proceed with a mandate that has no plan or safety net for buildings and tenants, If this passes we will all pay and Portland will lose so much of what makes it livable. Please vote "No" on the retrofiting mandate this coming Wednesday.

Thank You,
Shelby Kray