

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Conflict of Interest Form/Video/Homework

Member	Sub-Committee	Conflict of Interest Form	Conflict of Interest Video	HR Video Form	Homework Received
Peter Angel	FP	Y	Y		Y
Pippa Arend	FP	Y	Y		Y
Dave Beh	FP		Y		Y
Anthony Bencivengo	FP	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shirley Chalupa	FP	Y			Y
David Chown	FP	Y	Y		Y
Thomas Aquinas Debpuur	NP		Y		
Jennifer Eggers	NP		Y		Y
Don Eggleston	NP	Y	Y		Y
Abe Farkas	FP		Y		Y
Maya Foty	FP	Y	Y		
Carolina Gomez	NP		Y		
Pastor Walter Hills	NP		Y		
Pastor Mark Jackson	NP				
Robert Jepsen	FP				Y
Sue Levine	NP	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mary-Rain O'Meara	NP	Y			
Nicolas Petersen	NP				Y
Kathy Rogers	FP	Y	Y		Y
John Russell	FP	Y	Y		Y
Vik Savara	FP		Y		
Tom Sjostrom	FP	Y			
Andrew Smith	NP	Y	Y		Y

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Annette Stanhope	FP	Y			
Mark Stevenson	NP				
Pastor Roy Tate	NP		Y		
Bart Yanoch	FP	Y	Y		

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Resolution

Original Draft

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that both subgroups shall evaluate reasonable seismic retrofit support, incentives, and voluntary program standards and present their findings, including both majority and minority reports ... (Emphasis added.)

Angel	Arend	Beh
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that both subgroups shall evaluate reasonable, economically feasible voluntary seismic retrofit support, incentives, funding, and voluntary program standards and present their findings, including both majority and minority reports ...	BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that both subgroups shall evaluate fair and verified seismic retrofit funding , support, incentives, and voluntary program standards and present their findings, including both majority and minority reports.	Because this is all voluntary, I have no edits. I would like the city to help people make upgrades to their buildings. I think this is not much different than the status quo that we have under title 24.85 other than the city could help identify incentives to motivate upgrades.
Bencivengo	Chalupa	Chown

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Debpuur	Eggers	Eggleston
Farkas	Gomez	Pastor Hills
Pastor Jackson	Jepsen	Levin
		None

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

O'Meara	Peterson	Rogers
		None
Russell	Savara	Sjostrom
Smith	Stanhope	Stevenson

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Pastor Tate	Yanoch	
	BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that both subgroups shall evaluate <u>reasonable seismic retrofit funding , incentives, and uniform retrofit standards</u> and present their findings, including both majority and minority reports ... (Emphasis added.)	

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Bylaws' Purpose

Original Draft

... recommendations to reduce the life safety risks posed by URM buildings and to reduce displacement following a seismic event. ... develop recommendations that include: 1) financial and policy supports to promote seismic retrofits, recognizing the unique needs of commercial and non-profit building owners, and 2) standards for participation in voluntary support programs. It is not required or expected that the Workgroup will recommend mandatory retrofits of URM buildings that are privately owned. It is expected that support for voluntary retrofits will be scaled to need ...

Angel	Arend	Beh
	... recommendations to reduce the life safety risks posed by URM buildings and to reduce displacement following a seismic event. ... develop recommendations that include: 1) financial and policy supports to promote voluntary seismic retrofits, recognizing the unique needs of city-owned , commercial, and non-profit building owners, and 2) standards for participation in voluntary support programs. It is not required or expected that the Workgroup will recommend mandatory retrofits of URM buildings that are privately owned. It is expected that support for voluntary retrofits will be scaled to need ...	Public safety, minimizing risk and identifying a cost-effective method for seismic building upgrade. No edits because this is all voluntary. This is no difference between this than 24.85 other than providing incentives.
Bencivengo	Chalupa	Chown
		... recommendations to reduce the life safety risks posed by URM buildings and to reduce displacement following a seismic event. ... develop recommendations that include: 1) financial and policy supports to

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

		<p>promote seismic retrofits, recognizing the unique needs of commercial and non-profit building owners, and 2) standards for participation in voluntary support programs. (Reverse #1 and #2 to show priority) It is not required or expected that the Workgroup will recommend mandatory retrofits of URM buildings that are privately owned. It is expected that support for voluntary retrofits will be scaled to need ... This will be almost impossible to quantify. Who determines need? What is it based on?</p>
<p>Debpuur</p>	<p>Eggers</p>	<p>Eggleston</p>
	<p>... recommendations to reduce the life safety risks posed by URM buildings and to reduce displacement following a seismic event. ... develop recommendations that include: 1) financial and policy supports to promote seismic retrofits, recognizing the unique needs of commercial and non-profit building owners, and 2) standards for participation in voluntary support programs. It is not required or expected that the Workgroup will recommend mandatory retrofits of URM buildings that are privately owned. It is expected that support for voluntary retrofits will be scaled to need ...</p> <p>this is not a suggested edit, but the wording “reduce displacement following a seismic event” is heavily dependent on the work “reduce” so I strongly encourage keeping that in. A “Life Safe” building does not mean you can re-occupy.</p>	

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

	Specifically, a “Life Safe” URM building may or may not even be repairable after an event. Something to talk about as a group.	
Farkas	Gomez	Pastor Hills
<p>... recommendations to reduce the life safety risks posed by URM buildings and to reduce displacement following a seismic event. ... develop recommendations that include: 1) effective seismic retrofit options that optimize life safety and can be implemented in phases, 2) financial and policy supports to promote seismic retrofits, recognizing the unique needs of commercial and non-profit building owners, and 3) standards for participation in voluntary support programs. It is not required or expected that the Workgroup will recommend privately owned. It is expected that support for voluntary retrofits will be scaled to need ...</p>		
Pastor Jackson	Jepsen	Levin
		<p>This makes sense to me, given the history of the project. My hope is that economic incentives can be created that are enticing enough to result in buildings being retrofitted. Some organizations may need more than others to do so...</p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

O'Meara	Peterson	Rogers
		None
Russell	Savara	Sjostrom
<p>I don't have any suggestions for the Council resolution, but I think the bylaws need to be changed and expanded for two reasons: {1} the capitalized term "URM" has a specific meaning in the building code that may not have direct meanings for public safety and {2} if the underlying issue is public safety in the event of a major seismic event, there are other building types than masonry that may be public safety hazards.</p>		

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Smith	Stanhope	Stevenson
Pastor Tate	Yanoch	Additional Input
	<p>... recommendations to improve the safety risk factors posed by URM buildings and to reduce displacement following a seismic event. ... develop recommendations that include: 1) financial and policy supports to promote seismic retrofits, recognizing the unique needs of the City of Portland owned URMs, commercial, and non-profit building owners, and 2) standards for participation in voluntary support programs. It is not required or expected that the Workgroup will recommend mandatory retrofits of URM buildings that are privately owned. It is expected that support for voluntary retrofits will be scaled to need ...</p>	

Umbrella Question

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Original Draft

How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings;

While at the same time reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities;

Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?

Angel	Arend	Beh
<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable, and uniform set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings;</p> <p>While at the same time reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities;</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>	<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable set of feasible voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit all commercial and non-profit URM buildings, whether commercial, non-profit, or city-owned;</p> <p>While at the same time increasing safety and resiliency for our community, avoiding fire sales to developers and the resulting displacement, maintaining current and local ownership, naturally lower rents and protecting the architectural character of our main streets;</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, seismically resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>	<p>Public safety, minimizing risk and identifying a cost-effective method for seismic building upgrade. No edits because this is all voluntary. This is no difference between this than 24.85 other than providing incentives.</p>
Bencivengo	Chalupa	Chown

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

	<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings;</p> <p>Establish seismic retrofit standard for URM buildings that follows the accepted industry practices from other cities with similar issues, that will be economical, realistic and achievable;</p> <p>While at the same time reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities;</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>	<p>Change the order of the paragraphs to change the emphasis:</p> <p>How can we reduce eliminate life safety risks, reduce avoid displacement, and promote the maintenance of maintain the architectural character of our communities; (I think we need to prioritize these. Life safety is first, the rest is negotiable. In a major seismic event some displacement and building damage is unavoidable. Life safety is not negotiable; everything else is.)</p> <p>While at the same time collaboratively creating a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need (how is need determined?) to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings;</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>
<p>Debpuur</p>	<p>Eggers</p>	<p>Eggleston</p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

	<p>How can we reduce life safety risks, reduce displacements after a seismic event and maintain the architectural character of our communities ;</p> <p>While at the same time collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to the need to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings;</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p> <p>Notes: I feel the word “reduce” is important here vs. “avoiding” I’m interested in what the “technical” resource might look like...would like to talk to the group about this. Agree with leaving terminology in – but this could mean a variety of different things that will be developed and determined over time.</p>	
Farkas	Gomez	Pastor Hills

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

<p>How can we collaboratively craft a voluntary seismic retrofit program that reduces life safety risks, minimizes displacement and its impacts, and maintains the architectural character of our communities, create a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings;</p> <p>While at the same time reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities creating a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit private commercial and non-profit URM buildings</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>		
<p>Pastor Jackson</p>	<p>Jepsen</p>	<p>Levin</p>
	<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings; - Is the idea to provide some basic content of the seismic engineering requirements for a URM building? <i>If this is the case, I'd be concern on the viability of such a task given the different constraints each building has to offer. Each building would require an</i></p>	<p><i>This also makes sense to me based on my current knowledge of the project.</i></p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

	<p>independent review by an engineer to suggest solutions to their underlying URM issues.</p> <p>While at the same time reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities; - I'd suggest that we visit the work "avoiding" due in part to not understanding to which lengths any seismic retrofitting is needed and the potential impacts it may have on the occupants.</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>	
O'Meara	Peterson	Rogers
<p>While at the same time reducing life safety risks, ensuring feasibility of necessary and immediate building improvement, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities;</p>		<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit commercial and non-profit all URM buildings, including city-owned buildings & schools.</p> <p>While at the same time making buildings safer reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities, and protecting affordable rents.</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire to find funding to make seismic retrofits possible. for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient</p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Russell	Savara	Sjostrom
<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit commercial and non-profit URM buildings; <i>again, I believe that we need to expand our definition of dangerous buildings beyond masonry. See (1) above.</i></p> <p>While at the same time reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities;</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>		<p>community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Smith	Stanhope	Stevenson
<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically viable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to voluntarily retrofit commercial and non-commercial Portland’s URM buildings;</p> <p>While at the same time ensuring equitable outcomes reducing life safety risks, avoiding displacement, and maintaining the architectural character of our communities;</p> <p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire to protect human lives and our cultural identity, while creating a for an equitable multi-faceted, resilient community before, during, and after an earthquake?</p>		
Pastor Tate	Yanoch	
	<p>How can we collaboratively create a cost-effective, economically attainable set of voluntary financial, technical, and support resources scaled to need to retrofit the City of Portland, commercial and non-profit URM buildings;</p> <p>While at the same time increasing safety factors , avoiding displacement, preserving traditional ownership, and maintaining the architectural and cultural character of our communities;</p>	

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

	<p>Thereby satisfying our shared desire for an equitable, multi-faceted, resilient infrastructure and community in the event of a seismic occurrence.?</p>	
--	---	--

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Workplan

		Original Draft		
		<p align="center">Phase One: “Setting the Table”</p> <p>I. Background</p> <p>II. Exploring the Scope of Work</p>	<p align="center">Phase Two: What are we trying to achieve?</p> <p>III. What levels of URM retrofitting are we trying to achieve?</p> <p>IV. What are the benefits of URM retrofitting to those levels? To whom?</p> <p>V. What are the burdens of URM retrofitting to those levels? To whom?</p> <p>VI. What are the magnitude of scale costs to achieve the various levels?</p> <p>VII. What are the current financial options? Others? Where do we get funds?</p> <p>VIII. What are reasonable costs to be covered? What would it cover? Are there less expensive ways to abate the hazard than partially retrofitting?</p>	<p align="center">Phase Three: Additional Support Strategies (Non-Financial)</p> <p>IX. What are the support issues/problems we are trying to solve? What is our goal?</p> <p>X. What non-financial support strategies are worth pursuing?</p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Member	Sub-Committee	Phase One: "Setting the Table"	Phase Two: What are we trying to achieve?	Phase Three: Additional Support Strategies (Non-Financial)
Peter Angel	FP			
Pippa Arend	FP		<p>Honestly, Sam, these are not good questions. They are very leading, and will just drive the conversation into the hypothetical, wherein the actual DOERS will be forced to be in the position of the naysayers... again.</p> <p>Of course: we should all retrofit all buildings to the maximum level, just as we should all drive Hummers and never cross bridges but none of this matters without funding. Any retrofit beyond the current code is hypothetical without funding. It would be better to review the current code, which, remember, actually works when enforced, and does so without evictions, firesales, unnecessary demolitions, and is targeted to all vulnerable buildings in an equitable and feasible way.</p> <p>So, I would recommend these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the current seismic code – How does it work? What are its successes? What are its failures? • What are the levels of seismic retrofits? 	

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond the current code, what levels of funding are needed to incentivize further seismic retrofits? • What are the levels of seismic retrofits? • What are the burdens of URM retrofitting to those levels? To whom? (This is yours. See, I like some of them!) • What information is needed to determine the magnitude of scale costs to achieve the various levels? • Which buildings should be prioritized? Schools? Low income housing? Large Community / Event spaces? City-Owned? • Should we (as a city) invest in an accurate list of seismically vulnerable buildings? • VII. What are the current financial options? Others? Where do we get funds? • What are alternative, less expensive seismic retrofit, seismic resiliency (gas shut-off valves) and early warning technologies? • What are related issues? Liquifaction? Housing Crisis? Rents? 	
<p>Dave Beh</p>	<p>FP</p>	<p>No edits to the order/agenda. I would like to talk to a banker that would actually do the lending and</p>		

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

		a general contractor so that we can come up with better cost estimates and financing models.		
Anthony Bencivengo	FP		<p>What should tenant relocation and quality of life protections during retrofits look like? What have they looked like in other cities which have implemented URM retrofit programs?</p> <p>What might it look like to place affordability requirements and/or rent controls on buildings receiving retrofit grants or subsidies? What can we learn from previous attempts to do this in Portland and other cities?</p>	
Shirley Chalupa	FP	Understanding accepted retrofit standards and triggers from other jurisdictions such Seattle, San Francisco, etc	<p>Add: What are the different levels of URM retrofit goals for different users?</p> <p>Add: Should we look at revising city of Portland and the state of Oregon seismic retrofit standard and triggers to match other jurisdictions?</p>	
David Chown	FP			
Thomas Aquinas Debpuur	NP			
Jennifer Eggers	NP	I. Background (will this include background of URM buildings/expected damage, etc... from an engineering standpoint too?)	<p>III. What levels of URM retrofitting are we trying to achieve?</p> <p>ADD: What are the financial benefits to retrofitting for long term resiliency?</p>	
Don Eggleston	NP		Part 1, Scope and then using levels in Phase two., of the Workplan. If by	

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

			<p>standard, do you mean the Building Code Requirement or by levels the Risk Class per City of Portland Guidelines, issued June of 2018. This portion of our efforts, I see as the most difficult in getting clarity of what a voluntary upgrade to any URM structure means and what code standard the upgrade needs to meet, that is approved by the City structural Engineers.</p> <p>I think it is worth the Task force understanding the impact of not doing something to start the City on a path toward dealing the hazards that URM Buildings pose to the Community.</p>	
Abe Farkas	FP	I. Background – Portland (and metro area), and pertinent experiences of other cities (in US and elsewhere)	III. What levels of URM retrofitting are we trying to achieve to save lives? What levels to help save buildings? (assuming these may not be the same)	
Maya Foty	FP		Add: Are there creative solutions to URM upgrades that the City would consider via a non-prescriptive permitting path (use of FRP, CLT, etc) that could potentially be less costly and invasive than traditional methods?	<p>what about identifying financial strategies? Isn't this one of the greatest obstacles to URM upgrades?)</p> <p>Do you mean what strategies can the City of Portland implement to assist building owners to encourage them to retrofit their URM buildings?</p>
Carolina Gomez	NP			

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Pastor Walter Hills	NP			
Pastor Mark Jackson	NP			
Robert Jepsen	FP			
Sue Levine	NP			
Mary-Rain O'Meara	NP			
Nicolas Petersen	NP			
Kathy Rogers	FP		<p>III-A. What are the levels of seismic Retrofitting & what are the costs & benefits associated with each level</p> <p>III-B. What levels of URM seismic retrofitting are we trying to achieve, in order to qualify for funding?</p> <p>IV. What are the benefits of URM seismic retrofitting to those levels? To whom?</p> <p>V. What are the burdens of URM seismic retrofitting to those levels? To whom?</p> <p>VI. What are the magnitude of scale REAL costs to achieve the various levels?</p> <p>VII. What are the current financial options? Others? Where do we get funds? Who from our city & state officials can we get involved to help find funding at the state & federal level?</p>	

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

John Russell	FP		<p>V. What are the burdens of URM retrofitting to those levels? To whom? I might be able to explain my own experiences</p> <p>VI. What are the magnitude of scale costs to achieve the various levels? See V above</p>	<p>IX. What are the support issues/problems we are trying to solve? What is our goal? The goal is an accurate assessment of public safety issues</p>
Vik Savara	FP			
Tom Sjostrom	FP			
Andrew Smith	NP			
Annette Stanhope	FP			
Mark Stevenson	NP			
Pastor Roy Tate	NP			
Bart Yanoch	FP	<p>I believe we need to further address the City's current seismic codes and plans for upgrades, as well as the history behind it's adopting and implementation said codes. What exists now? What's worked? What hasn't?</p>		<p>X. What non-financial support strategies are worth pursuing? What education can we bestow upon our citizens that are simple effective methods for dealing with a seismic event?</p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

		Phase Four: WG Implementation and Monitoring Suggestions	Phase Five: Final Recommendations
		XI. What are the next steps in developing an education and outreach program for the options we recommend?	XII. What are our final recommendations? XIII. Any other Recommendations to City Council with Next Steps?
Member	Sub-Committee		
Peter Angel	FP		
Pippa Arend	FP		
Dave Beh	FP		
Anthony Bencivengo	FP		Finally, I think that a lot of issues discussed in the for-profit subcommittee (including tenant rights issues) will be equally relevant in the non-profit subcommittee, and vice-versa. I would like to set aside at least one meeting for each subcommittee to present its recommendations to the other for feedback and possible revision. These presentations could be given by the the subcommittee chairs.
Shirley Chalupa	FP		
David Chown	FP		
Thomas Aquinas Debpuur	NP		
Jennifer Eggers	NP		
Don Eggleston	NP		
Abe Farkas	FP	XI: What are the criteria we're going to use to evaluate our recommendations?	

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Maya Foty	FP	Is there a timeline that should be established for recommended implementation work?	
Carolina Gomez	NP		
Pastor Walter Hills	NP		
Pastor Mark Jackson	NP		
Robert Jepsen	FP		
Sue Levine	NP		
Mary-Rain O'Meara	NP		
Nicolas Petersen	NP		
Kathy Rogers	FP		
John Russell	FP		
Vik Savara	FP		
Tom Sjostrom	FP		
Andrew Smith	NP		
Annette Stanhope	FP		
Mark Stevenson	NP		
Pastor Roy Tate	NP		
Bart Yanoch	FP		
			<p>XII. What are our final recommendations? Define where our funding is coming from and what structures can be upgraded first. How do we incorporate our new path to seismic upgrades with our existing codes?</p> <p>XIII. Any other Recommendations to City Council with Next Steps? How can we avoid the past errors that the City had</p>

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

			made in regard to committee decisions and implementing their recommendations?
--	--	--	---

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Topic/Speaker

Member	Sub-Committee	Topic	Speaker
Peter Angel	FP		Ben Kaiser Rudy Manzel
Pippa Arend	FP	<p>Background from the point of view of the building owners, since the city was able to present their version. She can also speak to the current code, and how/when it works and how / when it doesn't.</p> <p>Alternative methods, such as Early Warning Systems that is being implemented in Beaverton.</p>	Angie Even Ben Kaiser
Dave Beh	FP	<p>General Contractor that has worked on a variety URM upgrades to better understand the costs for an upgrade.</p> <p>A lender so that we can better understand the finance options for these upgrades.</p>	
Anthony Bencivengo	FP	Tenant Issues	Marisa Zapata Asst. Lauren Everett
Shirley Chalupa	FP	<p>Get participation from other jurisdictions</p> <p>Cost Data</p>	R&H

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

		Seattle retrofit code and cost analysis for retrofit in Portland.	Nancy Devine (Seattle building department) Jake Sly (RH Construction) Brad Sisk (Siteworks)
David Chown	FP		
Thomas Aquinas Debpuur	NP		
Jennifer Eggers	NP	Earthquakes and Damage Background of performance objective levels for discussion so everyone understand terminology.	Bill Tremayne Jennifer Eggers
Don Eggleston	NP	Seismic Impacts	DOGAMI, the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, either Ian Madin, Senior Scientist, Earthquake Hazard Geologist, ian.madin@oregon.gov , 971-673-1542 or Yumei Wang, Resilience Engineer, yumei.wang@oregon.gov , 503-913-5749
Abe Farkas	FP		
Maya Foty	FP	Building Official and Fire Marshal for the City of St. Helena in the Napa Valley during which time a mandatory URM policy was implemented.	Cindy Heitzma, Executive Director of the California Preservation Foundation, 101 The Embarcadero, Suite 120, San Francisco, CA 94105-1215, 415-495-0349

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

		<p>The design of structures with an emphasis on seismic resistance, including dozens of historic buildings.</p> <p>Use of cross-laminated timber panels for seismic retrofits on unreinforced masonry buildings.</p>	<p>Loring A. Wyllie Jr. MSCE, P.E., S.E., N.A.E.</p> <p>Andre Barbosa, 541-737-7291 Andre.Barbosa@oregonstate.edu</p>
Carolina Gomez	NP		
Pastor Walter Hills	NP		
Pastor Mark Jackson	NP		
Robert Jepsen	FP		
Sue Levine	NP	<p>Designed the seismic retrofit at Cedarwood Waldorf.</p> <p>https://www.linkedin.com/in/benjamin-kaiser-3ab3585/</p>	Ben Kaiser
Mary-Rain O'Meara	NP	<p>General Contractor representatives who understand the full scope of work and implementation on the construction side for URM upgrades—recommendations</p>	<p>Anderson Construction</p> <p>Bremik Construction</p> <p>Colas Construction</p> <p>Lorentz Bruun</p>
Nicolas Petersen	NP		
Kathy Rogers	FP	Background	Angie Even, representing Save Portland Buildings

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

John Russell	FP	Background In my extensive experience, there are two superior structural engineering firms here. They can explain the nuances of public safety for seismic events	KPFF and Grummel Engineering.
Vik Savara	FP		
Tom Sjostrom	FP		
Andrew Smith	NP		
Annette Stanhope	FP		
Mark Stevenson	NP		
Pastor Roy Tate	NP		
Bart Yanoch	FP		

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Chair/Co-Chairs

Member	Sub-Committee	Non-Profit Chair/Co-Chair Nomination	For-Profit Chair/Co-Chair Nomination
Peter Angel	FP		
Pippa Arend	FP		Pippa Arend
Dave Beh	FP	Shirley Chalupa Jennifer Eggers Andrew Smith	Maya Foty Robert Jepsen
Anthony Bencivengo	FP		Pippa Arend Shirley Chalupa
Shirley Chalupa	FP		Shirley Chalupa
David Chown	FP		
Thomas Aquinas Debpuur	NP		
Jennifer Eggers	NP	Chair: Carolina Gomez	Chair: Peter Angel Co-Chair: Maya Foty Co-Chair: Abe Farkas
Don Eggleston	NP	Don Eggleston	Abe Farkas
Abe Farkas	FP		

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Maya Foty	FP	Jennifer Eggers	Bart Yanoch Abe Farkas Maya Foty
Carolina Gomez	NP		
Pastor Walter Hills	NP		
Pastor Mark Jackson	NP		
Robert Jepsen	FP		
Sue Levine	NP		
Mary-Rain O'Meara	NP	Open	
Nicolas Petersen	NP		
Kathy Rogers	FP		Pippa Arend David Chown
John Russell	FP		John Russell
Vik Savara	FP		
Tom Sjostrom	FP		
Andrew Smith	NP	Chair: Carolina Gomez Co-chair Jennifer Eggers	
Annette Stanhope	FP		
Mark Stevenson	NP		
Pastor Roy Tate	NP		

First Meeting Draft Homework Summary: 1-29-20 Draft

Bart Yanoch	FP		
--------------------	----	--	--