



URBAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda

Tuesday, July 22, 2014
5:00 pm

Madison Avenue Meeting Room
500 SW Madison Avenue

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Discussion/ Possible Action | I. Demolition Permit Changes – Collaboration Recommendation (Attachment) |
| Discussion/ Possible Actionb | II. Climate Action Planning |
| Information | III. Other Business |

Next Scheduled Meeting

Tuesday, August 5, 2014 at 5:00 pm
Madison Avenue Meeting Room, 500 SW Madison Avenue

Agenda

Explanatory Statement: Residential Parking Districts

MEMORANDUM

To: Urban Services Committee
From: Ken Gibb, Community Development Director 
Date: July 14, 2014
Subject: OSU Collaboration Project – Item 2-21, Demolition Process for Residential Structures

I. ISSUE

At the March 17, 2014 City Council meeting, the City Council considered a series of recommendations from the OSU Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee including the Neighborhood Planning Workgroup's recommendations related to demolition of residential property. The Council accepted these recommendations and referred the demolition related items to the Urban Services Committee (USC) for a review and recommendation back to Council.

II. BACKGROUND

Collaboration Corvallis Recommendations

The Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee recommended to Council that the City of Corvallis make changes in the appropriate codes and ordinances and fee schedules to increase the requirements and the fees for demolition of residential property in the City.

The following will highlight the Collaboration recommendations related to residential demolitions:

- Increase demolition permit fee to cover costs of processing increased demolition permit requirements.
- Require a 35 working day notice (to neighborhood associations and posted on-site) prior to demolition permit issuance to and require the owner to offer the structure to be acquired and moved by a willing party.
- Define demolition as "the complete destruction or removal of a residential structure, or the removal of more than 50% of the perimeter walls.
- Require that the owner of the property proposed for demolition offer the property for purchase and relocation for a period of 35 days with requisite notice.
- Establish a registry of persons and businesses for notification of whenever a demolition permit is submitted for a single family residential property.
- Consider what incentives might be provided to a property owner to assist in rehabilitation or relocation of the structure.
- Require that notice be given regarding DEQ requirements for hazardous materials abatement.
- Require that City and DEQ contact information be posted at a demolition site.

- If moving is not an option, consider a requirement that a percentage of the non-hazardous materials remaining be diverted from landfills or reused.
- Require that prior to demolition, the owner provides photos of the façade of the structure.

Exhibit A is an excerpt from the staff report to the City Council related to these recommendations and it includes a summary of the basis for the recommendations. Exhibit B includes agenda packet materials for the August 22, 2013 and September 5, 2013 Neighborhood Planning Work Group meetings at which the demolition recommendation was the primary topic area. Exhibit C includes the meeting notes from the August 8, 2013 public outreach meeting that the Neighborhood Planning Work Group conducted related to this proposal.

Current Demolition Process

The demolition permit process has been administered by Development Services since 1989. While the state building code does not adopt provisions for demolition permits, the current locally adopted process follows close alignment with the state code for issuance of permits so as to minimize confusion for applicants and contractors. The Building Code Chapter 9.01 of the Corvallis Municipal Code (CMC) contains provisions for demolition permits in section **9.01.030 Scope** which states:

*This code shall apply to the construction, alteration, moving, **demolition**, repair, maintenance and work associated with any building or structure except those located in a public way, or work associated with hydraulic flood control structures or public utility poles and towers.*

In addition, under the section titled **Powers and Duties of the Building Official**, (CMC Section **9.01.080.010 3**) it states:

*The building official shall have the power to render written and oral interpretations of this code and to **adopt and enforce administrative procedures** in order to clarify the application of its provisions. Such interpretations, rules, and regulations shall be in conformance with the intent and purpose of this code.*

The Building Official has maintained a process as required by CMC for demolishing structures. This process is outlined in Development Services Procedure PRO 3001 (Exhibit D) Development Services maintains a web page and handouts (Exhibit E) containing a variety of information dedicated to the demolition of structures. The number of issues which must be reviewed in an application for demolition permits has grown significantly over the years due to state and other laws. The current process maintains conformance with those laws.

As the Collaboration project recommendations are being considered, Staff notes the following:

- Target Timelines - The current target timeline for review and approval of a demolition permit is 5 business days.
- Fees - Fees for review and inspections are based on the value of the demolition. Current fees for demolition permits do not recover costs and fees have been slated for review.

- Photos – Development Services Procedure 3001 was modified in November 2013 to include the collection and transmission of photos consistent with the Collaboration recommendation.
- Reports and Notice – Online reports were also added with an optional subscription based delivery to notify interested parties of demolition permit applications received.

III. DISCUSSION

As evidenced by the attached material, the Neighborhood Planning Work Group spent considerable time considering the recommendations related to demolition permits for residential property. Some recommendations are relatively straightforward in terms of implementation, e.g. noticing requirements, photos and fees. Others such as a requirement to re-use or divert from the land fill a certain percentage of non-hazardous material and examining potential incentive programs will likely take more time to evaluate in terms of feasibility and specific requirements. One approach may be to break the recommendations into implementation packages after initial USC review of the recommendations and Staff will be prepared to discuss options at the meeting.

Staff recommends that this initial meeting be a review of the recommendations with Staff available to provide background and answer initial questions. USC could then discuss a strategy for moving forward with review, public comment, and a recommendation to the City Council.

IV. REQUESTED ACTION

USC direction regarding the process of considering the demolition permit recommendations is requested.

Review and Concur:



Jim Patterson, City Manager

Attachments:

- A: Excerpt from 3/17/14 CC Staff Report
- B: Neighborhood Work Group Agenda Packets 8.22.13 & 9.5.13
- C: Neighborhood Work Group Summary of Meeting 8/8/13
- D: Outline Procedure for Issuance of Demolition Permits
- E: Development Services Division Demolition Permit Instructions

Excerpt From March 17, 2014 City Council Staff Report

Scope of Work Objective 2 – Review current development standards, and identify potential measures that would minimize potential impact from the creation of high density housing in or near lower density residential areas.

- a. Develop and enact Land Development Code (LDC) language that would implement selected mitigation measures (measures to mitigate impacts to neighborhood character, privacy, parking, and other issues, as identified).

Recommendations

1. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis make changes in the appropriate codes and ordinances and fee schedules to increase the requirements and the fee for demolition of any residential property in the City. The work group further recommends that the City of Corvallis consider including the following elements as a part of the relevant codes and ordinances for issuance of a demolition permit:
 - Increase demolition permit fee to cover costs of processing increased demolition permit requirements.
 - Require owner to provide a “35 working-day notice” to all neighborhood associations and post a notice at the property under consideration for demolition before the demolition permit is issued.
 - For the purpose of determining when the notice described above is required, “demolition” should be defined as “the complete destruction or removal of a residential structure, or the removal of more than 50 percent of the perimeter walls.”
 - Require the owner to offer the structure to be acquired and moved by a willing party 35 working days or longer prior to issuance of demolition permit. Provide notice of how property was advertised for sale and bids received.

- Establish a registry of interested individuals and businesses that notifies the registrant whenever a demolition permit application has been submitted to the City of a single family residential property.
- Consider what incentives might be provided to a property owner to assist in rehabilitation or relocation of the structure.
- Require that the notice given by the owner, as described above, include information about DEQ requirements for hazardous materials abatement, if required, and how to report non-compliance with those requirements.
- Require that contact information regarding city and DEQ permits be posted at the site for neighbors to review in case violations are suspected.
- If moving is not an option, consider a requirement that a percentage of the materials remaining after excluding material that requires abatement (i.e. asbestos, etc.) must be diverted from landfills or must be reused.
- Require that prior to demolition the owner provide the city with photos of façade of the structure.

Basis for Recommendation

One result of increased demand for more student housing off campus has been an increase in the number of residential demolitions. Between 2008 and 2012, the City of Corvallis issued 77 permits for the demolition of residential structures, many of which were located inside of the Collaboration Corvallis Project Area and may have been historically significant. In comparison, only four residential structures were relocated as an alternative to demolition during this period of time. Although the demolitions that occurred between 2008 and 2012 represent a relatively small percentage of the total number of residential structures within the Project Area, the work group concluded that the loss of potentially significant historic dwellings is contributing to the gradual erosion of the community's existing character.

Receiving a demolition permit from the City of Corvallis is currently a straightforward process that generally results in a permit being issued within a matter of days. As with many other types of building permits, which are regulated by provisions contained in the State Building Code and not the Corvallis Land Development Code, a public notice is not issued to owners of adjacent property when a demolition permit has been requested. These conditions have resulted in neighbors receiving little or no advanced knowledge of when a house nearby, or even next door, will be demolished, causing a variety of concerns.

The Neighborhood Planning Work Group received public testimony regarding cultural and environmental impacts caused by demolition of residences in neighborhoods near the OSU campus. In addition to adverse impacts on the character of these neighborhoods were concerns about missed opportunities to relocate intact structures or recycle or reuse particular building materials, as well as concerns about the airborne release of environmental contaminants (e.g., lead and asbestos) during the demolition process. Potential increases to the cost of housing in the community as a result of increasing the requirements and procedural time frame for obtaining a demolition permit were also noted.

While the focus of the work group's discussions on this topic were related to older, potentially historic dwellings, it was acknowledged that the same set of concerns summarized above could apply to newer housing as well. For this reason, and because of limitations contained in State law regarding regulation of historic properties, the work group determined that it was appropriate to craft a recommendation that applies to the demolition of any residential dwelling.

The subject recommendation requires a notification period that would provide interested parties an opportunity to purchase and move a residence that would otherwise be demolished. In the event that a purchase agreement could not be reached, elements of the recommendation would result in greater awareness of the impending demolition and the relevant contact information for the Department of Environmental Quality in the event nearby residents are concerned about exposure to contaminants. Photographs of a structure's façade would also be submitted to the City of Corvallis for archiving, thus securing at least a visual record for future reference.

The recommendation also encourages the City of Corvallis to explore opportunities for developing a locally-based program for reusing and recycling building materials generated through the demolition process. Several models exist for such a program, including a robust system in the Portland metro area. However, it will be necessary to gain additional input from local stakeholders (e.g., property owners and construction trades) and service providers (e.g., Republic Services, Benton County, and Benton Habitat for Humanity) in order to successfully implement a program in the Corvallis area.



Meeting Agenda
Collaboration Corvallis
Neighborhood Planning Work Group
August 22, 2013
5:30-7:30pm
Madison Avenue Meeting Room
500 SW Madison Avenue

Meeting Materials:

- Memorandum – August 15, 2013, Additional Considerations Regarding Draft Demolition Recommendation
- Draft Summary Minutes – July 23, 2013
- Draft Summary Minutes – August 8, 2013

I. Introductions

II. Public Comment

III. Review of Summary Minutes

1. July 23, 2013
2. August 8, 2013

IV. Discussion Items

1. Overview of current demolition permit process and response to Aug. 8 work group questions (City staff)
2. Decision on draft demolition recommendation
3. Review preliminary rezoning exercise results

V. Adjournment



MEMORANDUM

TO: Neighborhood Planning Work Group

FROM: Eric Adams, Project Manager

CC: Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager, City of Corvallis
David Dodson, Campus Planning Manager, Oregon State University

DATE: August 15, 2013

SUBJECT: Collaboration Corvallis – Additional Considerations Regarding Draft Demolition Recommendation

Provided below are paraphrased comments and questions made at the August 8, 2013, public outreach meeting regarding the draft demolition permit recommendation. These are not intended to reflect the complete record of comments that were made at the meeting, but, rather, are intended to provide the work group with a summary of the perspectives that were offered by the community members who spoke. It should be noted that comments regarding impacts to “neighborhood character” caused by recent dwelling demolition have not been included, as the work group has already acknowledge those concerns.

- Environmental hazards (e.g., lead and asbestos) are significant disincentives to relocation of dwellings and reuse of some building materials.
- The Department of Environmental Quality doesn’t have adequate staff to enforce hazardous materials disposal violations associated with building demolition.
- Older homes are harder to heat and maintain than newer homes, which are more efficient and environmentally friendly.
- The option of providing property tax discounts (e.g., one year “tax free”) should be considered as a possible incentive to encourage relocation of existing dwellings.
- If a dwelling has already been purchased by the entity or person who intends to demolish it, would the 35 working-day notice period ever result in the dwelling not being demolished? Perhaps possible disincentives that would discourage demolition should be considered instead.
- A 35 working-day notice period would provide some prospective purchasers with the opportunity to buy and/or relocate the dwelling, which might not exist otherwise.

- Requiring that a certain number of windows and doors be salvaged and reused in the replacement structure would be relatively straightforward, and easy for designers and contractors to accommodate.
- Increasing the demolition permit notice period from 35 working days to 90 days would provide a more realistic period of time for a prospective purchaser to learn about the opportunity to buy and/or relocate the house.
- Emphasis should be placed on the reuse of building materials generated through demolition, and the term “recycling” should be used in place of “salvage”, as it currently appears in the draft recommendation.
- Rehabilitation of a dwelling has to be financially feasible in order for the owner to consider that approach as an alternative to demolition, and it’s often less expensive to simply demolish a dwelling and reconstruct with more modern, energy efficient materials.
- Interest accrued on property and construction loans can be substantial. Extending the length of time over which interest will be charged by adding a 35 working-day delay to the redevelopment process is going to increase the cost of new housing and cause some developers to reconsider projects in Corvallis.
- The possible incentives that might consistently encourage property owners to consider relocation as an alternative to demolition would have to be significant enough to compensate for the additional costs associated with that approach. Time delays, additional regulatory requirements, liability issues, and the availability of a receiving property would each be substantial disincentives to relocation.
- Locally, Benton Habitat ReStore is the only facility that will accept used building materials. However, they are very particular about what they will and won’t accept. For example, windows from a circa 1910 house were rejected because they are not as energy efficient as modern designs.
- If photos of dwellings have to be submitted in order to obtain a demolition permit, they should show the context of the dwelling in relation to the street.

In response to these comments and others, the work group asked project staff to provide responses to the following questions.

- Is there a permit that the City issues in order to move a structure? If so, what does it cost?
- Assuming the proposed 35 working-day notice period were implemented, could an applicant receive a refund for a demolition permit if another party offered to buy and/or move the structure within that 35-day notice period? Could all or a portion of the demolition fee be applied to the cost of a "move" permit (assuming there is such a thing)?

- Is there an enforcement role that City staff could assume for DEQ in order to address hazardous materials abatement related to demolitions? Could the cost of that enforcement role be included in the cost of a demolition permit?
- How, exactly, is the cost of demolition permit determined, and are there statutory limitations on how those fees are established?

City staff expect to have responses to these questions available for the work group's consideration either prior to the August 22, 2013, meeting, or will attend that meeting to discuss them in person.

As currently structured, the draft recommendation is composed of the following primary elements:

1. A **35 working-day notice**, during which the property owner is expected to offer the dwelling for sale in the hopes of it being purchased on another party who would either retain the dwelling in some form or relocate it to another property.
2. Providing **proof of DEQ permits** to the City of Corvallis prior to receipt of a demolition permit, and displaying DEQ contact information about such permits at the job site.
3. Specifying a **minimum percentage of non-hazardous building materials** that must be either reused or recycled following demolition of a dwelling.
4. Requiring **submittal of archival photographs** of the building to the City of Corvallis prior to obtaining a demolition permit.

Of these, requiring a minimum percentage of non-hazardous building materials be reused or recycled is likely the most complicated to implement. Underlying considerations include:

- What is a realistic percentage of building materials that could be reused or recycled from the stock of dwellings currently located in Corvallis? Would the period of construction and associated quality of materials used to construct a dwelling influence how much could be reused or recycled?
- Is the regional marketplace for the sale of used building materials adequate to accommodate the potential stream of salvaged materials that might be generated?
- Do existing resale businesses in the region (i.e., Benton Habitat ReStore) have the capacity and willingness to accommodate the potential stream of salvaged building materials?
- Are there companies in the region that possess the staff and expertise necessary to successfully deconstruct a dwelling so that a minimum percentage of the salvaged materials were available for resale or reuse?
- Do the regional waste collection and recovery facilities managed by Republic Services possess the capacity and infrastructure to collect, sort, and recycle the potential spectrum of building materials that would have to be captured in order to divert a meaningful percentage from the landfill?
- How would staff from the City of Corvallis track and confirm whether a minimum percentage of building materials generated through demolition of a dwelling were actually reused or recycled?

In an effort to answer some of these questions, project staff contacted representatives from the Benton Habitat ReStore and Republic Services, who shared the following information. A notation is included to indicate which organization provided each comment.

- “It is possible that 40-50% of building materials generated through dwelling demolition could be reused or recycled. However, dwellings constructed after the 1950’s are less likely to have a higher percentage of reusable or recyclable materials.” (ReStore)
- “Although dedicated staff are not currently available, it typically takes three days to one week to schedule a salvage consultation. This does not include actually deconstructing the building, which is not a service we currently provide.” (ReStore)
- “It typically costs between \$1,500-\$2,000 to complete a basic residential salvage operation, which would involve minimal deconstruction activity and focus on extracting appliances, windows, doors, cabinets, and plumbing fixtures.” (ReStore)
- “Our newest location has more capacity to accommodate additional building materials, and also allows us to store materials for transfer to other Habitat for Humanity resale facilities.” (ReStore)
- “The materials recovery facility (MRF) nearest to Corvallis that is managed by Republic Services and has the capability to accept most construction and demolition debris is located in Wilsonville.” (Republic Services)
- “Contractors can deliver mixed construction and demolition debris to the Wilsonville MRF, have it sorted for distribution into the various recycling streams, and receive documentation on how much of each material was recovered. Some larger projects recently completed in Corvallis have used this facility in order to comply with LEED certification requirements.” (Republic Services)
- “Constructing a MRF at Coffin Butte Landfill has been discussed, but doing so is dependent upon funding and regulatory approvals from Benton County and other government agencies. There are no immediate plans to construct such a facility at this time.” (Republic Services)

In addition to this information, a list of the materials currently accepted by the Benton Habitat ReStore is attached to this memorandum, (Attachment A). Also provided are two case studies prepared by the City of Seattle’s Office of Sustainability and Environment. The first summarizes deconstruction of a dwelling and the other discusses relocation of a dwelling, (Attachment B).

Lastly, as a point of reference, Attachment ‘C’ is a copy of the form provided by Portland METRO to track the amount of construction and demolition debris delivered to its MRF in order for a project to obtain LEED certification. It is worth noting that their regional waste management program requires all construction and demolition debris generated within the boundaries of the METRO service area must be processed at one of its facilities. Fines are imposed when contractors violate this requirement. The disposal rates for mixed construction and demolition debris (\$105-\$130 per ton) are roughly three to four times more expensive than the rate charged by Republic Services (\$30 per ton) for disposal of similar materials at Coffin Butte Landfill. This regulatory dynamic may directly encourage greater effort to reuse or recycle construction and demolition debris.



click for LARGER TEXT



Contact Us FAQs

SEARCH GO

ReStore »

- Home
- About Us
- Volunteer
- Support Us
- Sponsors
- Women Build
- ReStore
- FAQs
- Shop
- Donate
- Sponsor



Hours:
Tues-Sat, 9am-5pm

Donation Intake Hours:
Tues-Sat, 9am-4:30pm

Phone:
(541) 752-6637

Email:
[[email](#)]

Location: [[Google Maps](#)]
4840 SW Philomath Blvd.

To schedule a pick up:
call (541) 752-6637

Benton Habitat for Humanity ReStore is located at 4840 SW Philomath Blvd, Corvallis, Oregon. To make a donation, bring your items to our Donation Center on Philomath Blvd. Donations are accepted from Tuesday–Saturday 9am –4:30pm. If you are unable to bring in your donation, you can schedule a local pickup by calling our ReStore at 541-752-6637.

All items must be complete, clean and in working condition.

If you have any questions about our acceptance guidelines, please call the ReStore prior to drop-off. Donations may not be left without our approval or when the ReStore is closed.

NEW LOCATION:

4840 SW Philomath Blvd • Corvallis, Oregon 97333

(in the old Keith Brown Building Materials building) [see map >](#)

Office 541-752-3354 • ReStore 541-752-6637 • Fax 541-752-0884 • [Email](#)

© 2013 Benton Habitat for Humanity • [Privacy Policy](#)

All donations are tax deductible. Thank you for your support!

ITEMS WE ACCEPT

Appliances

White, almond, stainless steel, or black only. Must be clean and **100%** functional with no rust or missing parts. We accept electric stoves less than **10 years old**, gas ranges less than **15 years old**, air conditioners less than **10 years old**, dishwashers less than **5 years old**, water softeners less than **5 years old** and washers/dryers less than **15 years old**. Exceptions made for some older units in excellent condition. Approved furnaces, pellet and gas freestanding or insert stoves in good condition. HVAC parts in good condition.

Bath and Kitchen fixtures

Must be clean to be acceptable. We accept toilets less than **10 years old, low flow** (1.6 Gal), **Kohler** or **American Standard**. Handicap height toilets in white or almond in good condition with no chips or cracks. Sinks may not have chips, dents, stains, rust or excessive wear.

Building and Construction Materials

In good, clean condition with no rust. Flat stock 1/2 sheets or more. 'Up to code' items only. Gutter parts and pipes (over 4') in good condition. Bricks, blocks, cement, and grout. Ceiling and roofing materials must be new.

Cabinets

Must be complete with all drawers and doors. Must be structurally sound, with no rot or breakage. Missing knobs and separate doors are acceptable. Missing drawers upon approval only. Clear span (no cut-outs) counter tops.

Craft and Household Items

By management approval only. Mirrors must be in good condition and must not have any chips. Only unused wallpaper and carpets accepted.

NEW LOCATION:

4840 SW Philomath Blvd • Corvallis, Oregon
97333

(in the old Keith Brown Building Materials
building) [see map >](#)

Office 541-752-3354 • ReStore 541-752-
6637 • Fax 541-752-0884 • [Email](#)

© 2013 Benton Habitat for Humanity • [Privacy Policy](#)

Doors

Must be in good condition with no scratches, cracks, rot, holes or separations. Lights and inserts intact.

Electrical Items

Approved breakers/boxes, cords in good condition, fans, lights/parts, switches, wire.

Electronic Components & Parts

oregon
E-CYCLES
oregonecycles.org

Electronic components / TVs- CRT, LCD, flat panel, projection, etc. / Computer- desktops, laptops, CRT monitors, LCD monitors and other Peripherals.

Furniture

In clean and good condition with no excessive wear, tears, or stains.

Garden and Yard Items

Fencing materials, functioning lawn mowers and yard tools, plant pots, sprinkler parts, garden furniture, play structures.

Hardware

In good, clean condition with no rust. We accept knobs, hinges, locks, nails, screws, nuts, bolts, fasteners etc.

Lumber and Wood products

Lengths over 4 feet. Sheet stock at least 4' x 4'. Items must be free of nails and staples.

Paint, Stains, Adhesives

Reusable Paint—Containers should be at least 3/4 full and in excellent condition only.



Paint Recycling—We are a collection site for the Oregon PaintCare program and can accept eligible paint for recycling.

Plumbing

Pipes at least 4 feet long. Connections, faucets and parts must be in reusable and resellable condition.

Tools**NEW LOCATION:**

4840 SW Philomath Blvd • Corvallis, Oregon 97333

(in the old Keith Brown Building Materials building) [see map >](#)

Office 541-752-3354 • ReStore 541-752-6637 • Fax 541-752-0884 • [Email](#)

© 2013 Benton Habitat for Humanity • [Privacy Policy](#)

Ladders, manual and power tools in sound, working condition. Pre-approved electric motors.

Window Covering

Curtain rods, window dressing hardware, etc. Mini-blinds or venetian blinds subject to onsite approval.

Windows

Vinyl frames accepted. 'Up to code' only. Aluminum thermal pane **28" x 28" or smaller**. Low-E wooden frames. No cracks or missing panes, and no rot. Exceptions made for antique and unique items, upon approval by management.

ITEMS WE DO NOT ACCEPT

Bedding

Regular mattresses, sofas, boxsprings and bedding of any kind

Chemicals

Any household/yard/toxic chemicals are strictly not accepted. Please dispose of your chemicals properly. Check with Allied Waste for their regular hazardous waste events.

Clothing

Clothing, outerwear, etc.

NEW LOCATION:

4840 SW Philomath Blvd • Corvallis, Oregon 97333

(in the old Keith Brown Building Materials building) [see map >](#)

Office 541-752-3354 • ReStore 541-752-6637 • Fax 541-752-0884 • [Email](#)

© 2013 Benton Habitat for Humanity • [Privacy Policy](#)

Building Materials Salvage

Environmental and business development opportunity



About the project

Building type: single family home, one story

Square feet: 1200

Year built: 1935

Construction: wood frame, exterior brick veneer, concrete foundation

Salvage method: hybrid (partially mechanized) deconstruction

Location: Ballard neighborhood, Seattle

Project completed: September 2007

This building was slated for demolition in order to make way for a new pocket park in Ballard. Seattle Parks contacted Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) to see if SPU would be interested in using the building as a salvage case study.

Approach

SPU approached the Seattle Conservation Corps (SCC), a city service that trains youth in trade skills, to conduct the deconstruction. SCC in turn contacted a 501c3 (not for profit) deconstruction contractor. This allowed the

value of the salvaged materials to be characterized as a charitable donation by the building owner—a substantial tax benefit. This approach was later abandoned.

As a result, SPU contacted a salvage consultant who evaluated the property's salvage potential and provided an estimate of time and labor required using different deconstruction techniques. The consultant estimated that manual deconstruction would require approximately nine days for a crew of five, versus three to four days for a crew of four for a hybrid, or partially mechanized approach. In addition, the consultant would train SCC staff in salvage and deconstruction skills. Contracts were signed with both SCC and Re-Use Consulting.

To receive a demolition permit, the project was required to apply for a Master Use Permit to convert the land from residential zoning to public open space. Seattle has a "no net loss"

Project participants

Owner:

Seattle Parks Department

www.seattle.gov/parks

Salvage consultant:

Re-Use Consulting

<http://reuseconsulting.com>

Deconstruction:

Re-Use Consulting, Seattle
Conservation Corps

www.seattle.gov/parks/scc

Hauler:

Allied Waste

www.rabanco.com

Recycler:

Allied Waste; Seattle
Recycling + Disposal
Stations

www.seattle.gov/util

Pilot project funding:

Seattle Public Utilities

www.seattle.gov/util

Ballard Hybrid Deconstruction Training

A 1935 single family home was dismantled to make way for a small neighborhood pocket park in Seattle's Ballard neighborhood. Utilizing mechanized deconstruction methods, a total of 15-20 tons of materials were diverted from the landfill.

Attachment B-1

Resources

City Green Building, in Seattle's Department of Planning and Development, provides resources, education and technical assistance towards improving the environmental performance of buildings in Seattle. Materials salvage resources include a Green Home Remodel guide on Salvage & Reuse, sample deconstruction specifications and how to information on salvaging windows, doors and flooring. www.seattle.gov/dpd/GreenBuilding

King County GreenTools provides an online directory of recycling and salvage services for construction materials, lists recycling rates for local companies handling construction and demolition materials, and has additional deconstruction case studies. www.greentools.us

Seattle Dept. of Planning + Development Client Assistance Memos (CAMs)
 CAM 336: Reuse of Building Materials
 CAM 337: Demolition Permits
 CAM 1302: Building Material Salvage + Recycling
www.seattle.gov/dpd/publications/

WA Dept. of Ecology: Demolition Debris
 Describes the solid waste and hazardous waste elements of demolition debris.
www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/hwtr/demodebris/

For more information
 Seattle Public Utilities
 Joel Banslaben
joel.banslaben@seattle.gov
 (206) 684-3936



www.seattle.gov/util

This information available in other formats upon request.

Building Materials Salvage

Ballard Hybrid Deconstruction Training Case Study

housing law that requires either an approved building permit or a change of land use prior to granting a demolition permit.

Once the permit was issued, the structure was analyzed to identify hazardous materials; lead and asbestos were abated.

Salvage began by extracting interior, non-structural materials from the house. The deconstruction crew then began a *hybrid deconstruction* process, cutting the house into sections and removing the panelized elements using an outreach forklift and tractor. The panels were placed on the ground and the materials separated for reuse and recycling. The SCC deconstruction crew consisted of five laborers and two site supervisors split into two teams, one for panelizing and one for disassembling materials. Lumber and structural timbers, interior doors, kitchen cabinets, a fireplace mantle, sinks and a tub were salvaged. Unusable wood, porcelain (toilets), and metal was recycled.

Schedule

Week 1: Interior salvage; roof and main floor removed
 Week 2: Structural basement timbers salvaged
 Weeks 3+4: Deconstruction complete; concrete crushed for basement backfill; site cleaned.

Lessons learned

Space constraints dictated the need for a street use permit to place bins in the public right of way, adding expense to the project. Permitting processes and training the deconstruction workforce extended the project schedule. The crew's unfamiliarity with deconstruction practices likely contributed to a few minor injuries on site. In addition, the house had been vacant and boarded up, causing damage to doors and frames and reducing the value of the salvaged materials. More diligent materials tracking and identifying roles and responsibilities would have minimized mistakes (a load of recyclable wood likely ended up as demolition waste, and the asphalt shingles were not weighed). Also, recycling rates were reduced by contamination—mixing good wood with painted and/or treated wood.

The project attracted media attention, which in turn was helpful in raising awareness about salvage on projects; for example, staff at Sound Transit saw coverage of the project, leading to the Capitol Hill Redevelopment project in this Case Study series. In a private sector context, such coverage is essentially free advertising and positive public relations for the firms involved.

Materials analysis*	
Material	Tons
Wood (recycled)	3.75
Metal (recycled)	0.25
Commingled demo waste** (recycled)	0.09
Commingled demo waste** (disposed)	4.41
Concrete (crushed and used as fill on site)	
Tons diverted from landfill***	4.09
Total diversion rate: 48%	

* Salvaged materials tonnages are excluded from this table, due to lack of data.

** Recycling rate at Allied Waste's 3rd + Lander facility in September 2007 was 2%.

*** Concrete foundation was crushed and used on site; these tonnages are not reflected in the diversion from landfill.

Project costs	
SPU contribution: deconstruction	\$18000.00
Parks contribution: training	\$23200.00
Parks contribution: consultant costs	\$3000.00
Parks contribution: recycling + disposal	\$2300.00
Total project cost	\$46,500.00

Building Materials Salvage

Environmental and business development opportunity



About the project

Building type: single family home

Square feet: 1680

Construction: wood frame, two story, below-grade basement, detached garage

Year built: 1908

Location: Fremont neighborhood, Seattle

Project completed: September 2008

Diversion method: house moving

This 1905 Craftsman house had recently been painstakingly restored by its owners, who operated the home as a bed and breakfast. The neighborhood historical society considers the home one of the most architecturally significant houses of the Fremont neighborhood. However, the City of Seattle has promoted Fremont as an "urban village" and as a result development in the area nearest to shops and restaurants is often focused on increasing density where single family homes existed. As a result, developers purchased the home for the purpose of building townhouses, and the house

was scheduled to be demolished in Fall 2008.

Approach

The neighborhood and the Fremont Historical Society helped bring media attention to the house in hopes that it would be spared from demolition. They approached Nickel Bros. House Moving who quickly listed the threatened house on its website and were successful in finding a local property owner with plans to build a new home on his lot. The owner decided to move the existing lot to his property instead of building new.

Nickel Bros. prepared the house for moving by installing extra bracing, removing the basement wall and ceiling finishes, and loading the house onto two large structural beams. Dollies were placed under the rear portion of the beams while a tractor-truck was hooked to the front. The move was scheduled from 2:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on Saturday evening so as not to disrupt daytime traffic in the house's fifteen

Project participants

Owner: Private owner

House moving: Nickel Bros. House Moving
www.nickelbros.com

Project support: Seattle Public Utilities
www.seattle.gov/util

Fremont House Move

A historically significant 1905 home in Seattle's Fremont neighborhood is spared from demolition by a whole-house move from its original location to a nearby lot. The move resulted in the reuse of 85 tons of materials and an estimated \$100,000 savings to the new owner, compared to building new.

Attachment B-3

Resources

City Green Building, in Seattle's Department of Planning and Development, provides resources, education and technical assistance towards improving the environmental performance of buildings in Seattle. Materials salvage resources include a Green Home Remodel guide on Salvage & Reuse, sample deconstruction specifications and how to information on salvaging windows, doors and flooring. www.seattle.gov/dpd/GreenBuilding

King County GreenTools provides an online directory of recycling and salvage services for construction materials, lists recycling rates for local companies handling construction and demolition materials, and has additional deconstruction case studies. www.greentools.us

Seattle Dept. of Planning + Development Client Assistance Memos (CAMs)
 CAM 336: Reuse of Building Materials
 CAM 337: Demolition Permits
 CAM 1302: Building Material Salvage + Recycling
www.seattle.gov/dpd/publications/

WA Dept. of Ecology: Demolition Debris
 Describes the solid waste and hazardous waste elements of demolition debris.
www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/hwtr/demodebris/

For more information
 Seattle Public Utilities
 Joel Banslaben
joel.banslaben@seattle.gov
 (206) 684-3936



www.seattle.gov/util

This information available in other formats upon request.

Building Materials Salvage

Environmental and business development opportunity

block journey to its new location. Overhead utility wires had to be temporarily taken down along the move route and some low-lying trees had to be pruned and/or removed and replaced along the street. The remaining concrete foundation was later crushed for recycling. Some elements of the single-car garage were salvaged including; the garage door, windows, siding, trim, and dimensional lumber. The remainder of the garage was then demolished and disposed, along with the basement finishes.

Schedule

Within the twelve weeks that Nickel Bros. House Moving received word from the Fremont Historical Society of the house's impending demolition, the company was able to find a receiving property, secure all necessary permits, prepare the house and perform the move.

Lessons learned

The house move was successful from a triple bottom line approach. The developer saved money on demolition and disposal costs. The owner's total cost for the move (\$140,000) was offset by the house value on the receiving property, which is expected to be approximately \$350,000. With other finishing costs expected to total \$100,000, the owner is receiving a historic-quality house for about \$100,000 less than its projected appraisal value. House moving also helps save valuable resources and lessens environmental impact by reducing the demand for virgin materials for new housing.

The house move itself was particularly challenging given the house's height and the narrow streets in the residential Fremont neighborhood. The move route involved traversing an extremely steep hill and the moving logistics involved a great deal of upfront planning. The move took about twenty percent longer than expected and the utility wire moving costs roughly doubled based on the challenges on the route. A better understanding of the obstacles along the tight move route would have helped the house mover and the owner better anticipate moving costs.

In spite of the challenges, this project saved approximately 85 tons of demolition waste from disposal

and created local job opportunities equivalent to roughly 200-person hours for Nickel Bros. House Moving. The project also earned large amounts of media attention, providing education to the public house moving as a method for saving valuable resources from disposal.

Project costs + benefits

House move (includes permits, moving, utility line management, tree pruning + replacement)	-\$140000.00
Estimated remodel cost, post-move	-\$100000.00
Avoided disposal fees*	\$10200.00
Estimated value of house, post-move	\$350000.00
Savings over demolition/new construction	\$120,200.00

* Assumes \$120 per ton disposal rates

Materials analysis

Material	Tons
House (reused)	85.0
Concrete foundation (recycled)	49.5
Basement finishes (disposed)	2.0
Total tons generated	136.5
Total tons diverted from landfill	134.5

Total diversion rate: 98.5%

Succeed with LEED

How to maximize USGBC LEED recycling credits



**For construction and demolition contractors,
waste haulers, salvagers,
project managers and recycling facility operators
in the Portland metropolitan region**

July, 2008



Metro

Attachment C-1

EXHIBIT B 14

Purpose of this publication

This brochure and accompanying form aim to simplify the tracking and reporting of salvage and recycling data from U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) projects in the Portland metropolitan region. The standardized form will help project managers achieve maximum points under LEED v. 2.2 or other LEED products and minimize waste-related administrative costs.

The good news is that recycling is easier here in the Metro region than just about anywhere else in the United States, so it is not difficult to recycle 50 percent, 75 percent or even 95 percent of your LEED project waste.

The form within this publication can be used to track and report individual loads of recycling or salvage leaving LEED projects in the Metro region. It was specifically created to resolve the documentation problems that have arisen when LEED project debris is sent to one of the region's mixed-material recovery facilities and you need to know how much was actually recycled. Clearer documentation will also make it easier for project team members to understand recycling data and for LEED reviewers to understand and approve your LEED project recycling data.

Resources for recycling or salvage

Call Metro Recycling Information at 503-234-3000 or visit www.oregonmetro.gov/toolkit for a complete list of construction recycling and salvage facilities in the Metro region.

What materials count toward recycling under LEED?

The recycling or salvage of most non-hazardous building materials should count toward a project's overall recycling diversion percentage for LEED. This includes, but is not limited to, used building materials removed from the structure for reuse and recycling of concrete, brick, CMUs, sand, crushed rock, roofing, wood, cardboard, metals, glass, plastics, insulation, etc.

What materials do NOT count toward recycling under LEED?

Soil, dirt and topsoil scrapings from excavation or site-clearing do not count toward a project's overall recycling diversion percentage for LEED. Hazardous materials including asbestos, contaminated soil, mercury, and lighting parts containing polychlorinated biphenyl also do not count.

For maximum LEED points

- 1st** – Salvage and deconstruct as much as possible.
- 2nd** – Source separate the debris that is not salvageable.
- 3rd** – Deliver mixed debris to a mixed-material recovery facility.

Implementation tips:

- Distribute LEED recycling tracking forms to all subcontractors that will be taking project debris or salvage off-site.
- The general contractor should contact the material recovery facility operator that will be accepting the project debris to ensure the vendor is aware of this form and your reporting requirements. During and after the project, stay in contact with the mixed-material recovery facility to verify the accuracy of information reported on the LEED tracking form.
- Request that the mixed-material recovery facility operators and recycling facility operators complete a form for each load they accept. The hauler's role is to return the completed form to the LEED project manager.
- Consider using smaller 10- and 20-yard drop boxes to allow more space for source-separated recycling on small footprint job sites.
- Make payment for hauling services contingent on receiving a completed LEED tracking form for each load leaving the site.
- Appoint one LEED team member to oversee all LEED recycling data-gathering.
- Use "tons" in all calculations.

LEED Recycling and Salvage Tracking Form



Instructions: Form is to be filled out by the recycling facility, mixed-materials recovery (MRF) facility operator or salvage/demolition contractor. **Each load must have its own form.** Return completed forms to the party compiling the project's LEED documentation package. Additional copies of this form can be downloaded at www.oregonmetro.gov/toolkit.

Date/time: _____ Name: _____

Project name: _____ Invoice/job number: _____

Project address: _____

Hauler name: _____ Truck number: _____

Vehicle type (check one): Drop box Flat bed Truck/trailer Other _____

Type of facility: Choose one and fill out that section. (Sorting procedures for mixed-material recovery facilities are listed on the back)

SALVAGE/REUSE

Facility name: _____ Address: _____

Description of load: _____

Weight: _____

SOURCE-SEPARATED RECYCLING

Facility name: _____

Material type: _____

Portion of load that is not recyclable: _____ Weight: _____

End use (check one): Recycled into fuel product (hog fuel) Processed/recycled into new product

MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITY

Facility name: _____

Description of load: _____

Choose option A or B:

A. Use existing recovery percentage data. List the mixed-material recovery facility recovery percentage reported to Metro. Call 503-797-1663 to find out the mixed-material recovery percent for the months when your LEED-eligible project loads were delivered to these facilities.

Facility recovery percentage: _____ Weight: _____

B. Custom sorting: The facility operator must provide (1) actual weights for each load, (2) recyclable materials weight by category, (3) total disposal weight and (4) the resulting recycling percent for each load. See sorting procedures on reverse side. **Visual estimation is not allowed.**

Facility name: _____

Recyclable materials by type, weight and end use (e.g. "wood", "6 tons", "hog fuel")

Material (1): _____ Weight: _____ End use: _____

Material (2): _____ Weight: _____ End use: _____

Material (3): _____ Weight: _____ End use: _____

Material (4): _____ Weight: _____ End use: _____

Total disposal weight/recycling percent: _____

Facility operator signature _____ Date: _____

Attachment C-3

Sorting procedure:

Mixed project waste from each separate LEED project must be kept physically separate from other waste at each mixed-material recovery facility until the weighing and sorting process is completed.

If this is not possible, the overall facility recycling data reported to Metro (see *option A*) is the fallback data set and can be used as the LEED alternative recycling percentage.

1. Weigh the incoming load on a state-regulated scale. (Record the weight of the load, minus the vehicle/container weight.)
2. Tip the load into the segregated sorting area.
3. Sort the load into material categories – wood, corrugated cardboard, metal, roofing and concrete, for example.
4. Weigh the recyclables on a scale and record on Section B of the LEED Recycling and Salvage form:
 - Weight of each recyclable material category
 - End use for each material – hog fuel, compost, etc.

5. Subtract the weight of recycling from the total load weight (minus the vehicle/container weight) and record the overall recycling percent on the LEED Recycling and Salvage form.
6. Sign the form and send it to the LEED project manager/contractor.

Note: Data quality and accuracy are the responsibility of the party filling out this form. Metro makes no claim about the accuracy of the data provided on this form.

Call Metro Recycling Information at 503-234-3000 to learn more about recycling and salvage facilities in the Metro region.

For additional copies of this form:

www.oregonmetro.gov/toolkit

July 2008
Printed on recycled paper. 08202jg

PRESORTED
FIRST CLASS MAIL
US POSTAGE PAID
PORTLAND, OR
PERMIT NO. 1912

www.oregonmetro.gov/toolkit
600 NE GRAND AVE
PORTLAND OR 97232



Attachment C-4



MEMORANDUM

TO: Neighborhood Planning Workgroup

FROM: Eric Adams, Project Manager

CC: Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager, City of Corvallis
David Dodson, Campus Planning Manager, Oregon State University

DATE: August 22, 2013

SUBJECT: Collaboration Corvallis – Responses to Questions Concerning Current Demolition Permit Fees and Hazardous Materials Abatement

At the August 8, 2013, meeting, the work group asked project staff to provide answers to several questions regarding the current fees charged by the City of Corvallis for demolition permits, as well as the ability for City of Corvallis staff to enforce hazardous materials abatement laws regulated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The attached memorandum from Development Services Division Manager Dan Carlson contains the requested information.

MEMORANDUM

To Eric Adams, Collaboration Corvallis Project Manager

From Dan Carlson, Development Services Manager

CC Ken Gibb, Community Development Director

Date August 21, 2013

Subject Response to Questions Identified in August 15, 2013 Memorandum

The following questions were identified in the August 15, 2013 memorandum. Bulleted answers are provided immediately following each question:

- 1. Is there a permit that the City issues in order to move a structure? If so, what does it cost?**
 - Yes, the City requires a permit to move a structure over the public Right-of-Way (ROW).
 - The permit fee amount is \$100. The applicant may also need permits from ODOT and/or the County if they are moving the structure using streets that fall within their respective jurisdictional authority. Additionally, a permit to close portions of the ROW for vehicle parking is not required, however, is usually needed to ensure the dwelling can be moved off of the lot. The cost for this permit is \$25.

- 2. Assuming the proposed 35-working day notice period were implemented, could an applicant receive a refund for a demolition permit if another party offered to buy and/or move the structure within that 35-day notice period? Could all or a portion of the demolition fee be applied to the cost of a "move" permit (assuming there is such a thing)?**
 - Eighty percent of the permit fee can be refunded to the applicant if no work or inspections have been completed for the project. Additionally, a 12% State surcharge fee is paid at the time of the application, and is not refundable.
 - It is important to note that Development Services (DS) would most likely have completed all of the review and prepared the permit for issuance pending the 35 day time limit, therefore, DS would retain the appropriate amount of the fee which can often result in DS retaining a majority of the fee. Lastly, our current accounting practices would require we process a refund and DS would not apply a "credit" to another permit type or another applicant. This could be handled between private parties as part of the transfer of sale.

- 3. Is there an enforcement role that City staff could assume for DEQ in order to address hazardous materials abatement related to demolitions? Could the cost of that enforcement role be included in the cost of a demolition permit?**

- The enforcement role currently in place with City staff is to notify the applicant in writing, prior to demolition permit issuance, of the requirement to obtain hazardous materials abatement permits from DEQ. During the course of deconstruction and inspections, City staff have a cooperative and open line of communication with DEQ and will report observed issues of potential hazards for investigation.
- Contact with DEQ's Cathie Rhoades in the solid waste section indicated that they are adequately staffed. Cathie is assigned to and deals directly with hazardous waste complaints in Corvallis. She reports that Hazardous waste complaints such as asbestos or lead disposal are given a status of 'High Priority' with DEQ. Cathie reports that she makes every effort to provide an immediate response back for High Priority complaints.
- DEQ is not interested in entering into an IGA with the City of Corvallis or having Corvallis address hazardous materials disposal complaints and violations other than as a referral. DEQ indicated they have statutory responsibility for this activity and do not delegate this authority through IGAs with other Oregon jurisdictions. DEQ has a hotline phone number and online complaint form for timely addressing complaints.
- City staff does not currently have the staff expertise or professional credentials to perform specialized DEQ job functions for hazardous materials abatement. This role would need to be contracted with a third party provider such as a special inspection agency.

4. How, exactly, is the cost of demolition permit determined, and are there statutory limitations on how those fees are established?

- The cost of a demolition permit is based upon the valuation of the project. This methodology is established by Oregon Administrative Rule.
- Proposed permit fee changes must provide a public notice and public hearing. Permit fees are subject to approval from the State Building Codes Division. In our experience the approval of a new or revised fee related to building permits takes from 3 to 9 months.
- A recent demolition project for a home provided a job value of \$3,500. Demolition permit fees totaled \$177 (included fees for sewer cap, demo permit, water meter, and state surcharge).



Meeting Agenda
Collaboration Corvallis
Neighborhood Planning Work Group
September 5, 2013
5:30-7:30pm
Madison Avenue Meeting Room
500 SW Madison Avenue

Meeting Materials:

- Memorandum – August 27, 2013, Revised Final Draft Demolition Recommendation
- Memorandum – August 28, 2013, Example Definitions of “Demolition”
- Memorandum – August 30, 2013, Additional Information Regarding DEQ Asbestos Abatement Permits

I. Introductions

II. Public Comment

III. Review of Summary Minutes

1. NONE

IV. Discussion Items

1. Review memos regarding DEQ process for asbestos abatement “permits” and example definitions for “demolition”
2. Decision on draft demolition recommendation (*continued*)
3. Review preliminary rezoning exercise results

V. Adjournment



MEMORANDUM

TO: Neighborhood Planning Work Group

FROM: Eric Adams, Project Manager

CC: Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager, City of Corvallis
David Dodson, Campus Planning Manager, Oregon State University

DATE: August 27, 2013

SUBJECT: Collaboration Corvallis – Revised Final Draft Demolition Recommendation

At its August 22, 2013, meeting, the work group made the following changes to the current draft of the recommendation regarding demolition of residential structures. There will be an opportunity to make additional modifications at the September 5, 2013, meeting.

Proposed Draft Demolition Recommendation

Recommend that the City make changes in the appropriate codes and ordinances and fee schedules to increase the requirements and the fee for demolition of any residential property in the City. Recommend that the City consider including the following elements as a part of the relevant codes and ordinances for issuance of a demolition permit:

- Increase demolition permit fee to cover costs of processing increased demolition permit requirements
 - Require owner to provide 35 working days notice to all neighborhood associations and neighbors within 500 feet of property under consideration for demolition before permit is issued
 - Require the owner to offer the structure to be purchased and moved by a willing buyer 35 working days or longer prior to issuance of demolition permit. Provide notice of how property was advertised for sale and bids received.
 - Consider what incentives might be provided a property owner to assist in rehabilitation or relocation of the structure.
 - ~~Require that owner provide proof of permits from DEQ prior to issuance of demolition permit~~
 - Require that the notice given by the owner, as described above, include information about DEQ requirements for hazardous materials abatement, if required, and how to report compliance with those requirements.
 - Require that contact information regarding city and DEQ permits be posted at the site for neighbors to review in case violations are suspected.
 - If moving is not an option, require that a percentage of the materials remaining after excluding material that requires abatement (i.e. asbestos, etc.) must be diverted from landfills or must be reused
 - Require that prior to demolition the owner provide the city with photos of façade of the structure
-

In addition to these changes, the work group discussed the need to establish a threshold for determining when the extent of a proposed demolition would require notification, as described in the second bullet of the recommendation. The work group also requested more information concerning the process used by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to issue permits for hazardous materials abatement. Two separate memos will be included in the packet for the September 5, 2013, meeting in response to the work group's discussions on these aspects of the recommendation.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Neighborhood Planning Workgroup

FROM: Eric Adams, Project Manager

CC: Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager, City of Corvallis
David Dodson, Campus Planning Manager, Oregon State University

DATE: August 28, 2013

SUBJECT: Collaboration Corvallis – Example Definitions of “Demolition”

At the August 22, 2013, meeting, the work group asked project staff to research whether the Corvallis Land Development Code or relevant Oregon buildings codes define “demolition.” Such a definition could be used to determine when a 35-working day notice being considered by the work group for residential demolitions would be required. The Corvallis Development Services Division currently issues a demolition permit any time a portion of a building is being removed.

Neither the LDC nor the Oregon building codes specifically define “demolition.” While the demolition of historic structures is regulated through provisions contained in LDC Chapter 2.9, the act of demolishing a structure is defined by describing the actions it doesn’t qualify as, such as new construction or an addition to or modification of an existing structure.

For ease of implementation, a numerically based definition of “demolition” would likely be preferred by property owners, contractors, and City staff, as it would provide a clear and objective manner for determining when notification was required. A review of definitions from other jurisdictions that use a numeric threshold to define demolition indicates that a threshold of “50%” is typical. The following examples are offered for the work group’s consideration.

Los Gatos, California

- “Demolition of more than fifty (50) percent of all exterior wall areas.
- Failure to maintain a contiguous (connecting without a break) portion of existing exterior wall area that is 50% or more of the total exterior wall area.

- The remaining exterior wall area must maintain either the existing interior or existing exterior wall covering.”

Pasadena, California

“The complete destruction or removal of a structure or object, removal of more than 50 percent of the perimeter walls, or removal of any portion of a structural wall of a street-facing elevation of a structure that may have an adverse affect on the significance of a property.”

Fremont, California

“In the case of a building or structure lacking historical significance, the removal of 50 percent or more of the exterior walls or the roof form. Regarding an historic resource, ‘demolition’ means the destruction, removal or alteration of a building or structure in whole or in part.”



MEMORANDUM

TO: Neighborhood Planning Workgroup

FROM: Eric Adams, Project Manager

CC: Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager, City of Corvallis
David Dodson, Campus Planning Manager, Oregon State University

DATE: August 30, 2013

SUBJECT: Collaboration Corvallis – Additional Information Regarding DEQ Asbestos Abatement Permits

At the August 22, 2013, meeting, the work group asked project staff to provide additional information concerning the process used by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to issue and track asbestos abatement permits. The attached memorandum from Development Services Division Manager Dan Carlson contains the requested information.

In addition to this information, the Oregon Administrative Rules related to notification of asbestos abatement projects are also attached.

MEMORANDUM

To Eric Adams, Collaboration Corvallis Project Manager

From Dan Carlson, Development Services Manager

CC Ken Gibb, Community Development Director

Date August 30, 2013

Subject Summary of DEQ Permit Process for Hazardous Materials Abatement

Recently it was requested that we provide additional information regarding the state DEQ permitting process and how the DEQ administers hazardous materials investigations. The following are summary bullets of a recent phone conversation with Dotty Boyd of DEQ.

- Dotty administers permits for asbestos abatement in Corvallis and Benton County and conducts hazardous materials investigations regarding asbestos removal
- Performs approximately 100+ inspections per year with the majority being in Corvallis, primarily because of older structures on campus
- There is 'friable' and 'non-friable' asbestos
- Anyone can remove non-friable asbestos but more than half are done by asbestos abatement contractors
- Friable asbestos can only be removed by licensed and approved asbestos abatement contractors
- DEQ maintains a list of approximately 40 approved abatement contractors
- Contractors must fill out what DEQ refers to as a 'notice' of activity
- The notice is similar to what we refer to as a 'permit' to start work
- Notice contains a lot of information that must be provided by the person doing the work. Information includes among other things, when work will be done, start and end date, scope of work, etc. This is so that DEQ can schedule inspections. It is illegal for contractors to work outside the times stated in the notice.
- Typically Dotty does one inspection per project but it depends on the size of the project. Larger projects such as at OSU she will do 2 or 3 inspections.
- Chapter 9 of the Construction Contractors Manual covers environmental issues and awareness. All construction contractors take a test to get their CCB license and this material is covered on the test
- Dotty was complimentary toward the City in providing applicants for demo permits written notice in conditions of approval and links to DEQ from the CorvallisPermits.com website
- She indicated that the group most likely to slip through the cracks is homeowners with the least likelihood of knowledge. She indicated they do a lot of outreach and have a page on the DEQ website specifically geared toward homeowners.
- I asked Dotty if any jurisdictions had intergovernmental agreements (IGA) for local government to conduct hazardous materials inspections on DEQ behalf. Dotty indicated no.

- I asked if DEQ would consider an IGA with Corvallis for this purpose if we had staff expertise and equipment. Dotty said no.
- Dotty indicated that the state DEQ has formal agreement with the federal EPA to administer their programs for hazardous materials, and DEQ will not delegate that authority to local jurisdictions. She indicated they have the expertise and required safety equipment to do the job. She indicated she would not argue if someone wanted to give her more staff capacity, but she felt they were adequately staffed to handle the asbestos and other hazardous materials programs.

Oregon Administrative Rules Asbestos Abatement Notification

340-248-0250

Asbestos Abatement Project Exemptions

(1) Any person who conducts or provides for the conduct of an asbestos abatement project must comply with the provisions of OAR 340 division 248 except as provided in this rule.

(2) The following asbestos abatement projects are exempt from certain provisions of this Division as listed in this Section:

(a) Asbestos abatement conducted inside a single private residence is exempt from OAR 340-248-0110 through 340-248-0180, 340-248-0210 through 340-248-0240 and 340-248-0260 through 340-248-0270 if the residence is occupied by the owner and the owner occupant is performing the asbestos abatement work.

(b) Asbestos abatement conducted outside of a single private residence by the owner is exempt from the notification requirements contained in OAR 340-248-0260, if the residence is not a rental property, a commercial business, or intended to be demolished.

(c) Residential buildings with four or fewer dwelling units are exempt from the provisions of OAR 340-248-0270(1).

(d) Projects involving the removal of mastics and roofing products that are fully encapsulated with a petroleum-based binder and are not hard, dry, or brittle are exempt from OAR 340-248-0110 through 340-248-0280 provided the materials are not made friable.

(e) Projects involving the removal of less than three square feet or three linear feet of asbestos-containing material are exempt from OAR 340-248-0110 through 340-248-0180 and the notification requirements in 340-248-0260 provided that the removal of asbestos is not the primary objective, is part of a needed repair operation, and the methods of removal are in compliance with OAR 437 division 3 "Construction" Subsection Z and **29 CFR 1926, 1101(g)(i) through (iii) (1998)**. Asbestos abatement projects may not be subdivided into smaller sized units in order to qualify for this exemption.

(f) Projects involving the removal of asbestos-containing materials that are sealed from the atmosphere by a rigid casing are exempt from OAR 340-248-0110 through 340-248-0280, provided the casing is not broken or otherwise altered such that asbestos fibers could be released during removal, handling, and transport to an authorized disposal site.

(3) Any person who removes non-friable asbestos-containing material not exempted under OAR 340-248-0250(2) must comply with the following:

(a) Submit asbestos removal notification and the appropriate fee to the Department Business Office on a Department form in accordance with OAR 340-248-0260.

(b) Remove nonfriable asbestos materials in a manner that ensures the material remains nonfriable.

(c) A nonfriable asbestos abatement project is exempt from the asbestos licensing and certification requirements under OAR 340-248-0100 through 340-248-0180. The exemption ends whenever the asbestos-containing material becomes friable.

(4) Emergency fire fighting is not subject to this division.

(5) Asbestos containing waste material that is handled and disposed of in compliance with a solid waste permit issued pursuant to ORS 459 is not subject to OAR 340-248-0205(1).

Stat. Auth.: ORS 468 & ORS 468A

Stats. Implemented: ORS 468A.745

Hist.: DEQ 96, f. 9-2-75, ef. 9-25-75; DEQ 22-1982, f. & ef. 10-21-82; DEQ 9-1988, f. 5-19-88 (and corrected 6-3-88), ef. 6-1-88; DEQ 4-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-7-90 (and corrected 5-21-90 & 7-8-91); DEQ 8-1990, f. 3-13-90, cert. ef. 4-23-90; DEQ 18-1991, f. & cert. ef. 10-7-91; Section (1)(a) - (d) renumbered from 340-025-0465(4)(a) - (d); DEQ 4-1993, f. & cert. ef. 3-10-93; DEQ 18-1993, f. & cert. ef. 11-4-93; Renumbered from 340-025-0466; DEQ 19-1994, f. 9-6-94, cert. ef. 10-1-94; DEQ 15-1995, f. & cert. ef. 6-16-95; DEQ 22-1995, f. & cert. ef. 10-6-95; DEQ 14-1999, f. & cert. ef. 10-14-99, Renumbered from 340-032-5620; DEQ 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 2-4-02; DEQ 19-2002(Temp), f. & cert. ef. 12-23-02 thru 6-21-03; DEQ 9-2003, f. 5-21-03, cert. ef. 6-21-03

340-248-0260

Asbestos Abatement Notification Requirements

Except as provided for in OAR 340-248-0250, written notification of any asbestos abatement project must be provided to the Department on a form prepared by and available from the Department, accompanied by the appropriate fee. The notification must be submitted by the facility owner or operator or by the contractor in accordance with one of the procedures specified in sections (1), (2), or (3) of this rule except as provided in sections (5), (6), or (7).

(1) Submit the notifications as specified in section (4) of this rule and the project notification fee to the Department at least ten days before beginning any friable asbestos abatement project and at least five days before beginning any non-friable asbestos abatement project.

(a) The project notification fee is:

(A) \$100 for each project less than 40 linear feet or 80 square feet of asbestos-containing material, a residential building, or a non-friable asbestos abatement project.

(B) \$200 for each project greater than or equal to 40 linear feet or 80 square feet but less than 260 linear feet or 160 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(C) \$400 for each project greater than or equal to 260 linear feet or 160 square feet, and less than 1300 linear feet or 800 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(D) \$525 for each project greater than or equal to 1300 linear feet or 800 square feet, and less than 2600 linear feet or 1600 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(E) \$900 for each project greater than or equal to 2600 linear feet or 1600 square feet, and less than 5000 linear feet or 3500 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(F) \$1,050 for each project greater than or equal to 5000 linear feet or 3500 square feet, and less than 10,000 linear feet or 6000 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(G) \$1,700 for each project greater than or equal to 10,000 linear feet or 6000 square feet, and less than 26,000 linear feet or 16,000 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(H) \$2,800 for each project greater than or equal to 26,000 linear feet or 16,000 square feet, and less than 260,000 linear feet or 160,000 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(I) \$3,500 for each project greater than 260,000 linear feet or 160,000 square feet of asbestos-containing material.

(J) \$750 for annual notifications for friable asbestos abatement projects involving removal of 40 linear feet or 80 square feet or less of asbestos-containing material.

(K) \$500 for annual notifications for non-friable asbestos abatement projects performed at schools, colleges, and facilities.

(b) Project notification fees must accompany the project notification form. Notification has not occurred until the completed notification form and appropriate notification fee is received by the Department.

(c) The Department may waive the ten-day notification requirement in section (1) of this rule in emergencies that directly affect human life, health, and property. This includes:

(A) Emergencies where there is an imminent threat of loss of life or severe injury;

(B) Emergencies where the public is exposed to air-borne asbestos fibers; or

(C) Emergencies where significant property damage will occur if repairs are not made immediately.

(d) The Department may waive the ten-day notification requirement in section (1) of this rule for asbestos abatement projects that were not planned, resulted from unexpected events, and will cause damage to equipment or impose unreasonable financial burden if not performed immediately. This includes the non-routine failure of equipment.

(e) In either subsection (c) or (d) of this section persons responsible for such asbestos abatement projects must notify the Department by telephone before commencing work or by 9:00 am of the next working day if the work was performed on a weekend or holiday. In any case, notification as specified in section (4) of this rule and the appropriate fee must be submitted to the Department within three days of commencing emergency or unexpected event asbestos abatement projects.

(f) Failure to notify the Department before any changes in the scheduled starting or completion dates or other substantial changes will render the notification void.

(g) If an asbestos project equal to or greater than 2,600 linear feet or 1,600 square feet continues for more than one year from the original start date of the project a new notification and fee must be submitted annually thereafter until the project is complete.

(h) Residential buildings include: site built homes, modular homes constructed off site, mobile homes, condominiums, and duplexes or other multi unit residential buildings consisting of four units or less.

(2) Annual notification for small-scale friable asbestos abatement projects. This notification may be used only for projects where no more than 40 linear or 80 square feet of asbestos-containing material is removed. The small-scale friable asbestos projects may be conducted at multiple facilities by a single licensed asbestos contractor, or at a facility that has a centrally controlled asbestos operation and

maintenance program where the facility owner uses appropriately trained and certified personnel to remove asbestos.

- (a) Establish eligibility for use of this notification procedure with the Department prior to use.
- (b) Maintain on file with the Department a general asbestos abatement plan. The plan must contain the information specified in subsections (4)(a) through (4)(i) of this rule to the extent possible.
- (c) Provide to the Department a summary report of all asbestos abatement projects conducted in the previous three months by the 15th day of the month following the end of the calendar quarter. The summary report must include the information specified in subsections (4)(i) through (4)(l) of this rule for each project, a description of any significant variations from the general asbestos abatement plan; and a description of asbestos abatement projects anticipated for the next quarter when possible.
- (d) Provide to the Department, upon request, a list of asbestos abatement projects that are scheduled or are being conducted at the time of the request.
- (e) Submit project notification and fee prior to use of this notification procedure.
- (f) Failure to provide payment for use of this notification procedure will void the general asbestos abatement plan and each subsequent abatement project will be individually assessed a project notification fee.

(3) Annual non-friable asbestos abatement projects may only be performed at schools, colleges, and facilities where the removal work is done by certified asbestos abatement workers. Submit the notification as follows:

- (a) Establish eligibility for use of this notification procedure with the Department prior to use.
- (b) Maintain on file with the Department a general non-friable asbestos abatement plan. The plan must contain the information specified in subsections (4)(a) through (4)(i) of this rule to the extent possible.
- (c) Provide to the Department a summary report of all non-friable asbestos abatement projects conducted in the previous three months by the 15th day of the month following the end of the calendar quarter. The summary report must include the information specified in subsections (4)(i) through (4)(l) of this rule for each project, a description of any significant variations from the general asbestos abatement plan, and a list describing the non-friable asbestos abatement projects anticipated for the next quarter, when possible.
- (d) Submit project notification and fee prior to use of this notification procedure.
- (e) Failure to provide payment for use of this notification procedure will void the general non-friable asbestos abatement plan and each subsequent non-friable abatement project will be individually assessed a project notification fee.

(4) The following information must be provided for each notification:

- (a) Name and address of person conducting asbestos abatement.
- (b) The Oregon asbestos abatement contractor's license number and certification number of the supervisor for the asbestos abatement project or, for non-friable asbestos abatement projects, the name of the supervising person that meets Oregon OSHA's competent person qualifications as required in OAR 437, division 3 "Construction," Subdivision Z, 1926.1101(b) "Competent person," (2/10/1994).

- (c) Method of asbestos abatement to be employed.
- (d) Procedures to be employed to insure compliance with OAR 340-248-0270 through 340-248-0290.
- (e) Names, addresses, and phone numbers of waste transporters.
- (f) Name and address or location of the waste disposal site where the asbestos-containing waste material will be deposited.
- (g) Description of asbestos disposal procedure.
- (h) Description of building, structure, facility, installation, vehicle, or vessel to be demolished or renovated, including:
 - (A) The age, present and prior use of the facility;
 - (B) Address or location where the asbestos abatement project is to be accomplished, including building, floor, and room numbers.
 - (i) Facility owner or operator name, address and phone number.
 - (j) Scheduled starting and completion dates of asbestos abatement work.
 - (k) Description of the asbestos type, approximate asbestos content (percent), and location of the asbestos-containing material.
 - (l) Amount of asbestos to be abated: linear feet, square feet, thickness.
 - (m) For facilities described in OAR 340-248-0270(8) provide the name, title and authority of the State or local government official who ordered the demolition, date the order was issued, and the date demolition is to begin.
 - (n) Any other information requested on the Department form.
- (5) The project notification fees specified in this section will be increased by 50% when an asbestos abatement project is commenced without filing of a project notification or submittal of a notification fee or when notification of less than ten days is provided under subsections (1)(c) and (d) of this rule.
- (6) The Director may waive part or all of a project notification fee. Requests for waiver of fees must be made in writing to the Director, on a case-by-case basis, and be based upon financial hardship. Applicants for waivers must describe the reason for the request and certify financial hardship.
- (7) Pursuant to ORS 468A.135, a regional authority may adopt project notification fees for asbestos abatement projects in different amounts than are set forth in this rule. The fees will be based upon the costs of the regional authority in carrying out the delegated asbestos program. The regional authority may collect, retain, and expend such project notification fees for asbestos abatement projects within its jurisdiction.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 468 & 468A

Stats. Implemented: ORS 468.020 & 468A.025

Hist.: DEQ 96, f. 9-2-75, ef. 9-25-75; DEQ 22-1982, f. & ef. 10-21-82; DEQ 9-1988, f. 5-19-88 (and corrected 6-3-88), ef. 6-1-88; DEQ 4-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-7-90 (and corrected 5-21-90 & 7-8-91); DEQ 8-

1990, f. 3-13-90, cert. ef. 4-23-90; DEQ 18-1991, f. & cert. ef. 10-7-91, Renumbered from 340-025-0465(5)(a) - (d); DEQ 4-1993, f. & cert. ef. 3-10-93; DEQ 18-1993, f. & cert. ef. 11-4-93, Renumbered from 340-025-0467; DEQ 19-1994, f. 9-6-94, cert. ef. 10-1-94; DEQ 15-1995, f. & cert. ef. 6-16-95; DEQ 26-1995, f. & cert. ef. 12-6-95; DEQ 14-1999, f. & cert. ef. 10-14-99, Renumbered from 340-032-5630; DEQ 1-2002, f. & cert. ef. 2-4-02; DEQ 19-2002(Temp), f. & cert. ef. 12-23-02 thru 6-21-03; DEQ 9-2003, f. 5-21-03, cert. ef. 6-21-03; DEQ 9-2007, f. 11-21-07, cert. ef. 11-30-07



Collaboration Corvallis
Neighborhood Planning Work Group
Summary Meeting Notes
Corvallis-Benton County Library
August 8, 2013

Present: Lyn Larson, Tony Howell, Trish Daniels, Betty Griffiths, John Corden

Staff: Ken Gibb, Eric Adams

Meeting begins 5:30 PM

Introductions:

Trish Daniels: Welcome to the Collaboration Corvallis Neighborhood Planning Work Group public outreach meeting. We're here this evening to gather your comments on a proposed draft recommendation for additional requirements to obtain a demolition permit from the City of Corvallis. The copies of the current version of the recommendation are available on a table at the back of the room. Before finalizing it, we wanted to be sure to consider your input, so this is your opportunity to share your thoughts and concerns.

Before we begin, I'll now ask each of the work group members and project staff identify themselves and their affiliations.

Each of the work group members and project staff in attendance introduced themselves.

Public Comment:

See below.

Discussion Items:

1. Overview and Public Comment on Final Draft Demolition Recommendation

TD: So before we take public testimony, Eric Adams is going to provide an overview of the Collaboration project, as well as how we arrived at the current version of the draft recommendation.

Eric Adams: For those of you who haven't been participating or attending our other work group meetings, I wanted to start off with some background on why the Collaboration was started. Afterwards, we'll go over the particulars of the draft recommendation.

About two years ago, a Scoping Committee, composed of City of Corvallis leadership, executive administrators from Oregon State University, and other local community representatives and stakeholders, was formed in response to a variety of issues stemming from OSU's recent enrollment growth. This group developed what is referred to as the Collaboration Corvallis Scope of Work. It is divided into three different categories: Neighborhood Planning, Parking and Traffic, and Neighborhood Livability.

Once the Scope of Work was adopted, the Scoping Committee was reformulated as the Steering Committee. This 16-member panel continues to be made up of the same spectrum of stakeholders as the Scoping Committee and includes the Mayor, OSU's president, city councilors, executive administrators from OSU, student representatives, and other community members. They oversee and advise the three work groups. Each of the three work groups is also made up of community representatives, staff from OSU, and even a few OSU students.

The map I'm now showing is an aerial photo of the Collaboration Corvallis Project Area. In general, it covers an area bounded by Grant and Buchanan Avenues on the north, NW 9th and 5th Streets on the east, SW Western Boulevard on the south, and NW 35th Street on the west. In response to specific concerns, we have extended our consideration of various issues to include portions of the Harding Neighborhood that are outside of the Project Area boundary, as well as neighborhood areas within immediate proximity of the Linn-Benton Community College campus.

Through the Scope of Work, the Neighborhood Planning Work Group was tasked with three main issues. First, considering the pros and cons of making adjustments to zoning and density within the project area to encourage neighborhood-compatible infill development. Second, identifying potential development code amendments or modifications that would result in more neighborhood-compatible infill development. Lastly, evaluating ways to provide student housing in a manner that's compatible with the community as a whole. For example, some of the recommendations formed in response to that task encourage OSU to explore new methods of providing student housing on campus, as well as increasing the current percentage of students who are housed on campus. The work group also considered the merits of implementing various taxing strategies and urban renewal districts that might help direct student-oriented housing to certain areas of the community where compatibility conflicts would be less likely.

The recommendation that is the topic of tonight's discussion responds to a number of different issues that the work group has received testimony about. Among those

is the primary concern that neighborhood character is gradually being eroded by the demolition and redevelopment of dwellings within the Project Area. Many of the dwellings in the Project Area are historic, and the overall feel of the neighborhoods, their original development patterns and context, is changing as a result of recent redevelopment.

There were also concerns expressed about the diversity of housing being retained within the community. Because most of the recent development is targeted toward a younger tenant, potentially students, who many have greater willingness to live in a multi-story dwelling with smaller living spaces, some people have expressed concern that those newer units do not lend themselves to a broad spectrum of potential tenants over the lifespan of the dwelling. So, rather than demolishing dwellings that could provide that flexibility, the work group considered whether these was a way to encourage retention and remodeling of those structures.

The third issue focuses on sustainable development practices, specifically, what happens to the building materials when a dwelling is demolished. Are they simply taken to the landfill? Is there an attempt to recycle or reuse them? Several other communities either directly or indirectly address those questions through various regulatory programs and incentives, so the work group has been exploring what might be feasible in Corvallis.

Lastly, given the age of some of the dwelling being demolished, it is not uncommon for them to contain substances that are environmental health hazards, such as lead and asbestos. The surrounding neighborhood can be impacted if the demolition process is not managed well or conducted consistent with permitting requirements regulated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. This concern caused to work group to consider whether there are ways to better integrate the permits issued by DEQ with the demolition permits regulated by the City of Corvallis.

With that background in mind, the key pieces of the recommendation include the following:

1. A 35 working-day pre-demolition notice that would be mailed to all property owners and neighborhood associations within 500 feet of a proposed site;
2. Concurrent with that notice period would be a requirement to list the structure for sale for a period of at least 35 working-days;
3. The applicant would have to document how the opportunity to purchase the structure was advertised, as well as provide any bids that were received;
4. Encouraging the City to explore incentives that might cause property owners to either relocate or rehabilitate a dwelling that would otherwise be demolished;
5. Prior to receiving a demolition permit, the applicant would need to submit to the City proof of having obtained the necessary permits from DEQ.

6. Contact information for the DEQ would be required to be posted at the site if neighbors or others had questions about the demolition activities and potential environmental hazards.
7. In response to concerns over sustainable building practices, the recommendation stipulates that a minimum percentage of materials generated through the demolition process either be recycled or reused. In an earlier version, it was suggested that a threshold of 50 percent be used. There are other jurisdictions in the country who maintain a 50 percent threshold, but they also have a substantial program for recapturing construction and demolition debris.
8. Lastly, applicants would be required to submit photographs of the building's façade prior to demolition as a means of retaining a record of that aspect of Corvallis' history.

To facilitate our discussion tonight, I've prepared a list of questions that you might choose to respond to. These were not reviewed by the work group prior to tonight's meeting, I simply composed them based on comments the work group members and others have made during discussions on this topic over our last few meetings.

- Because the subject recommendation would apply to all dwellings in the community and not just historic structures, is it a correct assumption that each dwelling contributes to the character of a neighborhood? Are there situations when demolition might not just be appropriate, but necessary due to environmental health or other hazards?
- What regulatory or economic variables currently discourage building renovation or relocation?
- As a follow-up to that question, what incentives would respond to those conditions and actually encourage rehabilitation or relocation as an alternative to demolition?
- Is there a local labor force with the skills necessary to methodically deconstruct a dwelling so that the associated building materials were available for resale and reuse?
- How does the cost of demolition compare to those of the deconstruction process? Presumably there are differences in the length of time and level of effort needed to demolish a dwelling in comparison to deconstructing it.
- What percentage of a dwelling could realistically be reused or recycled? In some cases, the structures we're talking about are upwards of 100 years old and were constructed with old-growth timber and hardwood flooring, some of which may have a considerable longevity and potential for reuse. In other

instances, we may be talking about a dwelling that was constructed using asbestos-based flooring and exterior siding.

The work group may have other issues or questions on which they would like feedback, but the list I just shared covers the spectrum of considerations we've been discussing to this point.

Moving forward, the implementation process for recommendations developed by each of the work groups is as follows. The Steering Committee considers each of the recommendations and either accepts and forwards them, as may be appropriate, to either the City Council or OSU for further review, or refers them back to the subject work group for further consideration. Once passed on to either the City Council or OSU, it is up to each organization to decide how and whether to act on the recommendations. In the case of the subject recommendation, the City Council would need to determine whether to direct City staff to proceed with implementing the suggested changes to the demolition permit process. At each point or review along that decision chain, the public has an opportunity to provide input.

With that, I'll turn over the discussion to you and work group.

TD: Thank you, Eric.

So, now is your opportunity to provide your comments to us. Please be sure you've signed-in on the form at the back of the room prior to speaking.

Paul Ferrell: I've lived in Corvallis for 20 years on NW 7th Street near the Benton Center. Over the last several years, I've seen almost every single-family house on my block get torn down and redeveloped with three-story structures for students to live in. Yards are taken over by parking – parking increases. Traffic increases. We live on a dead-end street near the Benton Center, traffic has doubled, tripled. Every one of those five students living in each redeveloped dwelling has their own friends, and they're coming and going on a regular basis. When I read about the new parking requirements, it doesn't translate to what I'm experiencing. Each bedroom often has two people living in it, which, after accounting for their friends, equates to 2.8 cars per bedroom. The neighborhood has completely changed from when we first moved in.

Students are here for only a few years, and they have no interest in getting to know you, your kids, your pets. There are parties all the time, Thursday through Saturday. Livability has gone through the floor.

What's worse is that some of our neighbors are elderly and they live in houses without any private parking. So now, instead of being able to parking directly in front their homes, they have to walk several blocks with their groceries. It's not possible for them to install a driveway because it's prohibited.

When you take these older houses down – I used to work as a carpenter – when I installed new windows in my home using a City loan, I had to enclose the entire opening in plastic because I removed eight pieces of trim with lead paint on them. These houses you're talking about, 1920's, they're all coated in lead paint. The developers come in with a backhoe on a summer day and vaporize them, sending debris and dust throughout the neighborhood – on my yard, in my vegetable garden.

The elements of your recommendation are going to change any of that, in my opinion. If you move the house, if you sell the house, the expense is too high for most developers to even consider it. They all have asbestos and lead paint. The costs and risks are too great.

TD: What about the proposed requirement that the demolition permit won't be issued unless proof of DEQ permits is provided?

Paul F.: I brought that up with the guy who teaches the lead abatement class, he said there's no enforcement.

Also, the idea that 50 percent of a house could be saved – I don't know where that's coming from. As a carpenter, these houses are mainly lath and plaster. You're not going to be able to save or recycle any of that. And while you could likely do something with the trim and timber, there's still the issue of lead paint to deal with.

TD: Thank you for your comments. Are there any questions for Mr. Ferrell?

Tony Howell: One consequence of having a requirement for some level of building materials recycling – and you talked about the difficulty associated with that – is that it would perhaps change the decision to demolish the house to begin with.

Paul F.: They're not making a decision based on whether it's cheaper to remodel or demolish. What they're going for is the increased rent. The disincentives to overcome that income would have to be significant.

TH: So the particular houses that were demolished in your neighborhood, could you describe their quality?

Paul F.: The first one was from the late 1920's. It needed a lot of rehabilitation. If I'd been the one who bought it, I'd have taken it down too.

Lyn Larson: Do you think the proposed requirement that DEQ permits must have been obtained first would prevent the, as you put it, "vaporization" of these houses?

Paul F.: They're already getting the permits. It doesn't make a difference.

LL: But if there were stronger enforcement along with that?

Paul F.: It might, but the enforcement isn't going to necessarily stop the demolitions from happening. Even if they required homes to be sealed in plastic – which I'm not sure how you demolish a house with a backhoe that's covered in plastic – they'd still get demolished because the potential income stream is too great.

TD: Are there any other questions from the group? No? Okay, thank you.

Who would like to speak next?

Courtney Cloyd: I'm from the Central Park Neighborhood Association. I'm here to support the work group's proposed recommendation. The historic character of the Central Park Neighborhood is significant and an important contributor to the overall feel of this community. Preliminary data suggests that over 70 percent of the structures contained within the Central Park Neighborhood Association could be classified as historically eligible and contributing should we look at forming a historic district.

Many of these structures are smaller single family homes that have been converted to rental units. Three of the older houses have been demolished in the last 18 months, and been replaced with 10-bedroom duplexes or larger dwellings. A number of the rental units in the neighborhood are either poorly maintained or not maintained at all, making them prime candidates for demolition by neglect, which is a situation we very much would like to see avoided in the future. Demolition by neglect is a waste of the historic character of the downtown area.

Further, our neighborhood is a mixed use neighborhood, with smaller, affordable units. We feel that our neighborhood and others near the downtown and OSU represent a significant part of the stock of smaller single family homes existing within the community. Many of the lots are smaller, 5,000 square feet, which is smaller than lots in other portions of the city. They are likely to be more affordable for younger families, employees of OSU, aging retirees and others. This causes the neighborhood and others like it to have a diverse make-up of residents, a condition we've been losing over the last 6 to 10 years.

Given these conditions, we feel it's not in the community's best interest to tolerate additional loss of older single family homes. The character of the core of Corvallis should be preserved through forwarding the work group's proposed recommendation. Specifically, we support the requirement to provide 35 working-days notice before demolition permit is issued. We support encouraging opportunities for purchasing and relocation the house as an alternative to demolition. We support incentives to rehabilitate or relocate dwellings. And while there may be challenges with doing so, we support requiring that a minimum percentage of the building materials be reused or recycled. Finally, we support the requirement that photos of the structures be submitted to the city.

TD: Thank you, Courtney. Any questions from the work group?

TH: Would you be able to send a copy of the testimony you just read?

Courtney C.: Yes, I'll get it to you tomorrow.

NOTE: A copy of Mr. Cloyd's testimony is attached to these minutes.

TD: Okay, who would like to speak next?

Ruth McNeal: A huge amount of student housing has already been built. I assume there's been a huge increase in students already. How far along the total projected increase in students are we at this point?

TD: We've looked at that several months ago. Unfortunately, our representative from OSU who could elaborate on that isn't with us this evening. Does anyone else from the group remember what the situation was on increased enrollment?

John Corden: There was an article in the paper recently that a lot of the projected increases are either going to materialize at the Bend campus or through online courses. I seem to recall the projections were for another 2,000 to 3,000 students within the next 10 years.

Ruth M.: How many more have we got so far in comparison to five years ago?

EA: Since 2006, total enrollment has increased by 30 percent. That includes online students.

TD: I think total enrollment is about 26,000 students currently. In 1996, it was about 14,000.

JC: I've seen statistics that suggest, country-wide, the enrollment trends we've been seeing are starting to slow.

Ruth M.: I just want to know how many more housing units are going to be required.

TD: We did some work on that question quite a while ago, so I don't remember what the projected number was at the moment. But we could get you an answer. The number wasn't quite a big as you might suspect, from what I recall.

Ruth M.: Okay. Thank you.

TD: Next?

Charles Hiser: I used to spend a lot of time in the 1600 block of Harrison Boulevard visiting a friend who lived there. The house he lived in was eventually demolished. From my point of view, the new apartments that have been constructed in its place are a huge improvement. The conditions my friend lived in were terrible. Looking at this issue from a perspective of sustainability and energy conservation, older houses are harder to heat, they have lead paint. Newer construction resolves those issues.

TD: Any questions for Mr. Hiser? No? Okay, thank you.

Who would like to provide comments next?

Julie Hansen: I live in the "Cougar Hill" area of Corvallis, on Maxine Avenue, which is near the hospital. As I listen about your recommendation, this proposal is very timely, and I'll explain why in a minute, but I especially support the idea of a notice.

As far as incentives, perhaps the owner could be given a break on property taxes if they are able to move the structure instead of demolishing it.

Regarding the percentage of the structure that should be recycled or reused, that's sort of hard question to answer. It will vary depending on the structure based on the materials that were used to build it.

I also support increasing permit coordination with DEQ.

Now, why am I here? Our neighborhood is starting to feel what we call "the campus creep." I love living in a college town but I don't want to live near the campus. Our area has been the focus of development proposals in the last few months, such as Tract "B", and I was part of the group who opposed that project. It's not that I hate apartments, it was just that the proposal to place them at the end of a cul-de-sac was inappropriate. And now there's a proposal to rezone some property at the bottom of my hill at 9th and Maxine, to change it from RS-3.5 to RS-9. Most of the land between Elks Drive and Maxine Avenue along 9th Street is already RS-9. That includes a structure at 3140 NW 9th Street that I'm very interested in, which is an old one-room school house. I have a picture of it here. If you drive by it now, you probably wouldn't recognize it because it faces north and the original bell tower has been removed.

It's my understanding that the property has been recently purchased by a developer, and I'm concerned that this building could be demolished without any limitations, as it isn't covered by a historic overlay. Am I correct about that?

Ken Gibb: Yes, that's correct. Currently, there's no discretionary review associated with demolition permits.

Julie H.: Right. So this will get demolished unless someone does something. Which is why it's important to get your proposal in place quickly. That way we would know about the demolition permit and could make an offer to buy the building.

I realize they have a right to do what they want with their property, but it would be great to preserve this building for the community if there's a way to do it.

So, this is just an example of how your recommendation could be applied.

TD: Thank you for the feedback.

LL: Do you know if the structure has been remodeled?

Julie H.: I'm not sure. I don't think it's been added on to.

TD: Other questions from the work group? Okay, thank you.

Who's next?

Iris McCanless: I moved to Corvallis 15 years ago. We live on 14th Street and Tyler Avenue in a 100-year old house. We bought it because we loved the house and the neighborhood. I've been very frustrated with the changes that have been happening in our neighborhood. Existing rental houses are being torn down almost overnight and replaced with monstrosities. The most recent example I can think of is near 15th Street and Jackson Avenue.

The concept you've presented about imposing a 35 working-day notice period seems questionable to me. I'm not sure how effective it would be at preventing demolitions because, from my perspective, the houses have already been bought by the person who intends to demolish them. Why would they burden themselves with additional delay in order to sell and relocate the house?

I've also noticed that you rarely see a "for sale" sign in front of these places. One day there are renters living there, and then, maybe a few weeks later, the house is vacant, and shortly afterwards it's being demolished. So my theory is that the owners of the older rental properties are being pursued by developers who want to purchase the house for the sole purpose of tearing it down and redeveloping. If that's the case, then no one else who might be interested in buying the house or retaining it for whatever purpose is given the chance to buy it.

JC: That's problematic. What's suggested in this recommendation is an opportunity to move the house as an alternative to demolition, which doesn't currently exist as often because, as you've noted, few people who might be interested in taking that on are able to find out about it.

Iris M.: It just seems convoluted to me. How are you going to coordinate moving a house expediently enough to satisfy the developer? And, where are all of these relocated houses going to go – the suburbs?

Setting that aside, I think exploring incentives to rehab a structure is a great idea. One of my concerns is that the proposed property maintenance code will accelerate the pace of demolition, as the owners of poorly maintained dwellings will simply choose to demolish them instead of investing the time and money to get them up to code. If rehabilitation were encouraged through incentives, that might help to minimize that scenario.

I also think the reuse or recycling of building materials could be problematic. How are you going to define what constitutes “reuse” or “recycling”. Will people just end up dumping a bunch of junk and Benton Habitat ReStore?

Requiring applicants to submit photos of the dwellings prior to demolition is perfectly reasonable. However, I’d much rather look at the actual structures.

TD: Thank you. Any questions from the group? No? Okay.

Who would like to come up next?

Lori Stephens: I do support the waiting period. There have been houses demolished in our neighborhood that I would have loved to had the opportunity to salvage windows, wood flooring, cabinets, hardware, and other fixtures. Not everything from a building could be reused or recycled, but there is a potential there. For the general public, it would be easy to retrieve many of the items I listed.

One option for encouraging or requiring building materials to be reused would be to stipulate that whatever replaced a demolished structure incorporate a certain number of windows or doors from the original building. This could be called-out on the plans submitted to the City for issuance of building permits. It would be a simple starting point.

Regardless, I would like to see the city have a higher standard of design, and not allow “free for all” demolition. The citizens deserve a higher standard.

TD: Thank you. Any questions for Lori?

JC: When you suggest that plans submitted for a new, replacement structure show the windows and doors, are you talking about using items from the demolished structure?

Lori S.: Yes – as a potential starting point for reuse and recycling.

TD: Any other questions? No? Okay, thank you.

Carolyn Kindle: My husband and I, Gregory Wilson, live in the JANA neighborhood near 16th Street and Taylor Avenue. We support these suggested recommendations, in general, and their underlying intent. We do, however, have two modifications to suggest. First, the 35 day time period for relocation seems too short to allow for the necessary coordination needed to move a house. So a 90 day notice period would seem more realistic to allow for that. Second, regarding the reuse of materials, the version of the recommendation that we received doesn't place much emphasis on reuse and doesn't mention recycling.

Betty Griffiths: I think you were working from an older version. The current draft uses the phrase "diverted from the landfill", the intent of which is to encourage reuse and recycling. But you're suggesting that the actual word "recycling" be used?

Carolyn K.: From my perspective, reuse and recycling are two very different actions.

TD: We've discussed that point a fair amount. One of the work group members who isn't here this evening raised the question at our last meeting about what the underlying intent is of this aspect of the motion. We all agreed that it was to keep materials from entering the landfill, whether that be through recycling or reuse.

Carolyn K.: I understand that goal, but the emphasis should be on reuse with recycling as a secondary preference.

Regarding your question about whether the expertise exists locally to conduct deconstruction, my husband has taken me to the Rebuilding Center in Portland. It's a city-block of salvaged building materials, and they provide deconstruction services as well. The market in Portland is very established, and they should have the experience we'd need here in Corvallis.

I completely agree with Mr. Cloyd's earlier comments. Any way we can avoid further instances of demolition by neglect should be explored.

TD: Thanks very much, Carolyn. Any questions?

JC: Thanks for coming. The deconstruction service that's in Portland, do they charge for their services?

Carolyn K.: I'm not sure.

JC: I know that it's possible to get a tax credit for donating salvage materials to organizations like theirs. But, I also know that the fees for deconstruction can be pretty steep.

Carolyn K.: My knowledge of their business model is pretty limited. I know they are a non-profit, but they may be charging for deconstruction services.

Locally, we frequently use Benton Habitat ReStore. One idea would be to require that owners seeking demolition permits first contact ReStore to get an assessment of building materials that could be salvaged. It would benefit them through tax credits.

EA: Before you go, I wanted to get clarification on your comments about the notice period. What's proposed is a 35 working-day notice period, which would equate to seven weeks for 49 calendar days. So your recommendation of 90 days, is that calendar days for working days?

Carolyn K.: I tend to think in terms of quarters of the year, so it would be how many working days are in three months.

EA: Okay. So 90 working-days would be 126 calendar days.

Carolyn K.: I'm thinking three months, total, would be adequate.

EA: Okay.

As a follow-on to your comments about the Rebuilding Center, I've been talking with representatives from their organization and Portland METRO, the regional council of governments, about the building materials salvage and reuse market. There are approximately 100 businesses, nonprofits, etc. in the Portland area that deal in salvaged materials, which is an indication of how "rich" the market for those materials is. It also appears that some of that market may be driven by METRO's waste disposal program, as their fees for disposal are quite high. Additionally, they require that all construction and demolition debris generated within their service area be processed at one of their facilities. And, if you are caught transporting materials to an outside facility, they impose heavy fines. So, all of those things together could be creating a considerable incentive to reuse and recycle as many building materials as possible.

Carolyn K.: Sounds like a good model to learn from.

TH: Regarding our local market for used building materials, part of our challenge is determining what may be a realistic percentage that has to be recycled. It needs to be viable given the available resources. Do you have a sense of what ReStore is able to accommodate?

Carolyn K.: I don't, but would suggest contacting them directly.

EA: One of the members of the work group has dealt with them directly on a personal project, so we do have some indication of what they can and can't accept.

TD: Thanks for your time, Carolyn.

Next?

Matthew Fitchett: I work in the construction industry, and, for a lack of better term, a lot of what I do is “flipping”, residential rehabilitation. When I consider a new project, I always start with rehabilitation. I treat those projects the same way I treat my own personal finances, in that if it doesn’t make sense, I won’t take it on. One exception to that rule is the house I live in, which I rehabilitated to a pretty high standard. I ended up being “up-side-down” on it, and later discovered through discussions with other contractors that I probably could have accomplished the same outcome for less money had I demolished and reconstructed the whole house.

It’s an important factor for you to consider. If what you’re suggesting were going to be paid through your own personal finances, would the recommendation stand as it is? For many developers, the financial bottom line is the most critical factor. That becomes even more critical when you consider that most of them are using borrowed money. The more you delay the process of redevelopment, the more they are paying through interest.

I’m not aware of the houses in Corvallis that have been demolished, but I suspect that most of them were not generating as much property tax as other dwellings around them, and certainly generated less property tax revenue than what ultimately replaced them.

I’m also a member of the board for the Willamette Valley Home Builders. While I understand that a previous proposal to require photographs of buildings prior to demolition reached the City Council and was turned down, I actually support that aspect of your recommendation. As I mentioned before, a critical factor for a developer, contractor, or homeowner is the timeline for getting a project completed. While requiring photos may take a bit longer, I think it’s a reasonable thing to require in order to document the community’s history. I will say that it might be better received by the building community if it were voluntary.

TD: Thanks for your comments. Are there any questions for Matthew?

LL: Regarding the notice period, if the contractor knows about the notice period and can account for that as part of their overall project budget, doesn’t that make it less of an issue?

Matthew F.: I can build it in to my project schedule, it’s still going to cost me or my client money.

TD: That may be, but perhaps there are other tasks that could be worked on concurrently so the notice period is really adding to the total length of the project.

Matthew F.: That could be the case in some situations. However, as a matter of regulating someone’s ability to use their property, why should you have any more

control over whether I want to demolish my house than I have over whether you want to remodel yours? There are a few houses in my neighborhood that have been remodeled recently, and I wasn't asked by my neighbors if I cared for what they planned on doing. How is it you should have some additional level of control? Granted, I acknowledge that remodeling a house isn't generally going to cause traffic and parking issues, or generated some of the other neighborhood concerns that have been mentioned tonight.

A lot of what I've heard tonight is based on emotions people feel as a result of properties being demolished and redeveloped. I have to wonder how far we need to take regulations in order to address those personal interests.

TH: I just wanted to make sure that everyone understands the recommendation doesn't include establishing criteria or a process for determining whether a demolition permit should be granted. The 35 working-day notice period is simply to allow an opportunity for others to buy and relocate the dwelling.

Matthew F.: Sure. I understand that.

One additional thing I wanted to mention regarding the Rebuilding Center in Portland, they do charge to deconstruct a house. It's actually against IRS law for them to deconstruct a house in return for the associated building materials. The owner has to explicitly donate the materials.

The other comment I'd like to make regarding Habitat ReStore, when I rehabilitated my house, which dated to about 1910, I tried to take all of the original windows to Restore and they did not want them. Many of these reuse facilities are only interested in more modern, energy efficient materials.

TD: Thank you for taking time to provide your comments.

Anyone else?

Rana Foster: Eric mentioned that the recommendation is less rigorous than the current Land Development Code requirements. Why?

EA: They're less rigorous than the current standards for demolition of dwellings subject to the historic preservation provisions.

Rana F.: Can't you include those as part of this recommendation?

EA: We started with that approach but ran into limitations resulting from state law. If the historic preservation standards were reflected in the recommendation, it would result in every demolition permit requested for a dwelling having to be reviewed through a discretionary public hearing. There were concerns about taking that approach.

Rana F.: Could you require that the photos be taken so they reflect the street context of the dwelling?

And what about for the interior of the dwelling, especially for historic homes with original workmanship, wouldn't it be important to document that as well? It may also be worthwhile to document who built the house and may have lived there over its lifetime.

TD: I think it could be problematic to require photos of the interior. But understand that it's potentially an important aspect of the building's history.

But, requiring photos of the exterior so they show the street context seems viable.

Rana F.: Perhaps all of that information could be stored at the Benton County historical museum.

TD: Any questions for Rana? Okay, thank you.

Is there anyone else?

Iris M.: A few other comments. Obviously the incentive for tearing down these homes is money, so is there a way that we could shift that balance. Is there a way to "de-incentivize" demolition by "incentivizing" rehabilitation. Maybe that way you'd have people deciding to simply add on a few new rooms to accommodate additional housing rather than demolishing the whole thing.

Also, I think it's really important to require the reuse of as many building materials from the original structure as possible; particularly in what replaces it. Again, I think having that requirement would make demolishing houses less enticing.

And what about having a "waiting period", such that if you purchase a house you have to wait for a year until it can be demolished? That might not be legal, but it's something to explore.

At that rate these houses are being bought and demolished, it's questionable to me how effective a 35 or 90-day notice period is going to be. Few people who would be interested in purchasing them in order to save the house from demolition are actually going to have the financial resources available.

TD: True. But they certainly won't do it if they don't know about it to begin with.

Iris M.: Sure, I just worry about the "loop holes" that could undermine a solution that is really needed.

JC: One disincentive that was put in place as a result of work this group completed is the new parking standards for four and five bedroom multifamily dwellings.

Those are really going to slow the pace of demolition because developers can't get the same return as was previously possible.

TD: Any other comments you'd like to share with us, Iris?

Iris M.: No, that's all I have for now.

TD: Okay. Thank you.

Anyone else?

Julie H.: A few other thoughts about the notification process. The notification to surrounding property owners won't really accomplish much. It's not as though they're going to be able to stop the demolition if the request isn't being reviewed by a board or something. So I'd strike that.

The 35-day window for offering the house for purchase has more potential, as that would potentially attract someone who wanted to save the house from demolition. If that happened, then the issue would just be between the two private parties, and they could figure out which permits were needed.

TD: It's intended that those two 35-day periods run concurrently. It's just an attempt to give the immediate neighbors awareness of the opportunity to buy the house, or communicate with others who might be interested. The neighbors are going to be the most likely to be impacted, so it makes sense to get them that information.

JC: I think that even in the event of a move, the City still has to issue permits.

TH: The way I see it working is that the neighborhood association is more likely to take notice than someone who might happen to see an advertisement in the newspaper.

Julie H.: So what happens if I express interest on the 15th day of the notice period, and the "clock" is still ticking? Would it be allowed to run out if I can't come to terms with the property owner?

TD: It's a good question for us to consider. But that may be one of those details that would be resolved through subsequent discussions on the recommendation if it's forwarded to the City Council.

Is there anyone else who would like to share comments? Okay, thank you for coming.

Eric, is there anything you'd like to accomplish related to the rezoning exercise in the time we have left?

EA: No, I'd prefer we wait on that until the next meeting. However, you could review the minutes from the July 9th meeting.

Review of Summary Minutes:

TD: Yes, of course.

Is there a motion to approve the July 9th minutes?

BG: So moved.

TD: Is there a second?

TH: Second.

TD: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to approve the July 9th minutes. Are there any corrections or additions? Not seeing any indications of such, all those in favor of approving the minutes as presented say "aye." The minutes are approved.

Okay is there anything else for us to take care of?

EA: Ken wanted me to offer the opportunity for Dan Carlson, who is the manager for the Development Services Division, to attend the next meeting if the work group would like to ask questions about the current demolition process.

BG: I don't think he needs to come. But I think there are two questions that came up tonight that would be good to get answers for.

First, what are the requirements for a moving permit and what are the costs? Also, if the person applies for a demolition permit, but is able to find someone willing to move the structure within that 35-day period, is it possible to refund or reapply the demolition permit fee?

TH: Another question I have is whether City staff could assume any of the enforcement duties that DEQ would otherwise be responsible for? And, if that's possible, would the City be able to capture the costs of enforcement through the demolition permit fee?

I'm just focused on the negative externalities, costs, environmental impacts, etc., that are being passed on to the community as a result of demolition, and whether there are ways to incorporate those costs with the permit. Perhaps doing that would serve as a disincentive to demolition in some cases.

EA: Along those lines, Republic Services now manages both Coffin Butte Landfill and the Valley Recovery Center. The only construction debris that can be taken to the recovery center is lumber, where it's recycled into mulch. The fee to take materials there is \$7 per cubic yard. If you take waste directly to Coffin Butte, it's \$30 a ton. Based on other rates I've seen at facilities in the region, those seem pretty cheap. So when you talk about internalizing the costs of demolition that might be an important consideration.

TH: So we might need to talk with the person who manages the franchise agreement with the City.

BG: Actually, it's the County that manages the rates.

TH: Oh, that's right. The City just handles the collection service contract.

TD: Okay, I think that's it for tonight.

Meeting Adjourns

To: **Collaboration Planning Work Group**
From: Courtney Cloyd, Central Park Neighborhood Association, President
Date: 8/8/2013
Re: **Final Revised Draft Demolition Recommendations**

The Central Park Neighborhood Association (CPNA) supports the Collaboration Planning Work Group's proposed recommended changes to codes and ordinances pertaining to the demolition of existing residential structures in the City of Corvallis.

The CPNA's historic character, like that of the other older neighborhoods near OSU, should be protected. Specifically,

- Preliminary data indicates that **over 70% of the structures** in the CPNA could be classified as historically eligible and contributing, based on State Historic Preservation Office standards.
- Many of these structures are smaller single-family homes that have been converted to rental units.
- A number of these rentals are either poorly maintained or not maintained, making them candidates for what we call **demolition-by-neglect**; a situation we very much want to avoid in the future. For example:
 - Three older CPNA houses have been demolished in the last 18 months.
 - A demolition permit has been issued for one CPNA house in 2013, and at least one other house is vulnerable to the same fate.

This is a community-wide issue: affordable homes in mixed-use neighborhoods are essential to the City's character and livability.

- Houses in the CPNA and other neighborhoods near OSU are a significant part of the City's entire stock of smaller single-family homes.
- For the most part, lots in older neighborhoods are 5,000 square feet, substantially smaller than lots in the rest of the city, and the homes are generally smaller.
- Smaller homes are more affordable for young families, employees of OSU/Good Samaritan/other job generators, single professionals, working families with modest incomes, aging retirees, and others.
- Given Corvallis' changing demographics, and our local and regional economic challenges, it is not in the community's best interest to tolerate further loss of the limited stock of smaller, older single-family homes.

We urge the Collaboration Planning Work Group to help preserve the character of the core area of Corvallis by recommending the following:

1. A 35 working-day waiting period before issuing a demolition permit.
2. Explore incentives to assist property owners rehabilitation or relocation.
3. Owner must offer the structure for purchase and moving to a new site before a demolition permit is issued.
4. Recycle building materials after hazardous materials abatement.
5. Photos of the structure exterior must be provided to the City prior to demolition.



Community Development

Development Services Division
501 SW Madison Avenue
P.O. Box 1083
Corvallis, OR 97339-1083
(541) 766-6929
TTY (541) 766-6477
FAX (541) 766-6936

Policies / Interpretations / Procedures

PRO 3001

Adopted: January 3, 1989
Last Reviewed: November, 2013

OUTLINES PROCEDURE FOR THE ISSUANCE OF DEMOLITION PERMITS, INCLUDING THOSE FOR HISTORIC STRUCTURES

Procedure Summary:

1. Outlines procedure for the issuance of a demolition permit for historic structures subject to the City's historic preservation provisions in the Land Development Code (LDC).
2. Outlines method to determine what structures are subject to the City's historic preservation provisions in the (LDC).
3. Outlines procedure for the issuance of a demolition permit for structures which are not subject to the City's historic preservation provisions in the (LDC).

Background:

There are several important issues which must be addressed by City staff and the applicant before the issuance of a permit to demolish a structure. This is especially true if the structure is a historic resource regulated by the City's historic preservation provisions in the (LDC).

Discussion:

When reviewing a permit application to demolish a structure, staff first must determine if the structure is regulated as a historic resource under Chapter 2.9 of the (LDC). Such structures are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and/or the Corvallis Register of Historic Places (Local Register). The City has three Historic Districts; Avery-Helm, College Hill West, and Oregon State University. Properties in these Historic Districts are listed on the National Register and are subject to Chapter 2.9 requirements.

Procedure:

When reviewing an application for the demolition of a structure, the following procedure is to be followed:

1. Ensure that the permit application is filled out completely and documentation is provided as required by the demolition handout.
2. Ensure that the applicant is the owner or has written authorization from the owner to obtain the permit.
3. Prior to any demolition, the applicant must provide in electronic format, a minimum of three digital .jpg photos of 1024x resolution or higher, to include views: a) from the street context, the entire structure from grade to the topmost point; and b) the subject structure in relationship to any other structures on the site. Photos taken at night or where the result is an obstructed view (ex, behind trees or shrubs) are not acceptable. Photos will be attached to the case and forwarded via e-mail to the Benton County Historical Society & Museum.
4. Determine if the structure is on the Local or National Register. The parcels associated with such structures are "tagged" in Accela. If the property is tagged as historic, the applicant should be informed that the City's historic preservation provisions relating to the demolition of a historic structure apply. Double-check GIS to see if parcel / structure is located within a Historic District, or is designated as Historic. Refer the applicant to Planning staff for the necessary historic preservation permit follow-up. Once the necessary historic review has been completed, Planning staff will alert Development Services of the outcome and whether or not authorization to proceed with a demolition has been obtained, by what time frame.
5. Determine natural features which must be protected throughout the demolition process.
6. If underground storage tanks are located on the site, inform the applicant of the procedure to follow (PRO 3011).
7. Determine if the structure has a basement. If so, discuss with the applicant how it will be filled (i.e. structural fill - a compaction certification will be required).
8. If a water meter is serving the site, it is required to be removed. A water meter removal card must be completed and sent to Public Works. There is a fee to have it removed and replaced.
9. Determine if the demolition will expose 2,000 sq. ft. of soil surface. If so, a separate Erosion Prevention & Sediment Control (EPSC) permit is required per Corvallis Municipal Code, Chapter 9, Section 9.03.

10. Obtain the number and type of plumbing fixtures, the number and type of dwelling units, and the impervious area square footage for determination of SDC credit.
11. If the historical review process has already been completed, the permit may be issued. Additional permits may be required for the following:
 - sanitary sewer permit for the capping of the sewer service at the property line
 - curb cut permit for the required removal of any driveway approaches into the property and the restoration of the curbing to city standards
 - a permit to occupy public right-of-way must be obtained if utilizing the City right-of-way for staging purposes
 - if utilizing a State Highway right-of-way, the applicant must make contact with ODOT to secure appropriate permits
12. The applicant should be informed that he/she is responsible for contacting the utility companies that provide electricity, natural gas, telephone, and T.V. cable.
13. The applicant should be informed that he/she is responsible for contacting DEQ regarding asbestos abatement.
14. Determine the fees for the various permits. The demolition permit fee is based upon the cost (valuation) of the demolition. No plan review fees are charged.
15. The demolition permit fee for plumbing has been established at a fixed rate of \$50 and is designed to cover costs associated with administering the permit, at least one inspection, and to obtain and record the number and type of plumbing fixtures demolished to ensure accurate SDC credits to the parcel.

NEXT SCHEDULED REVIEW: November, 2015



DEMOLITION PERMITS

Community Development Development Services Division

501 SW Madison Avenue
P.O. Box 1083
Corvallis, OR 97339-1083
(541) 766-6929

Development.Services@corvallisoregon.gov

Permits are required for removing or demolishing structures in the City of Corvallis. Please submit the following information:

1. A site plan of the property showing the location of all structures on the lot, including buildings, pavement, sidewalks, patios, etc. Be advised that any reconstruction on the site will be required to comply with the current development standards (setbacks, parking, open-space, etc.)
2. Prior to any exterior demolition, provide in electronic format, a minimum of three digital .jpg photos of 1024x resolution or higher, to include views: a) from the street context, the entire structure from grade to the topmost point; and b) the subject structure in relationship to any other structures on the site, if any.
3. A complete list of all plumbing fixtures in and around the building.*
4. Square footage of the impervious area created by footprint of structures, paving, & graveled areas.*
5. If the removal of a basement is involved, describe proposed future use of lot and/or method of backfill and materials to be used.
6. Estimated cost valuation of doing the work.
7. If the applicant is not the property owner, written authorization from the owner shall be required prior to issuing the demolition permit.
8. If the demolition will expose 2,000 sq. ft. or more of soil surface, a separate Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control (EPSC) permit is required. Submit a completed permit application and 2 copies of an EPSC site plan showing the extent of ground disturbance on the site, sediment protection for all storm sewer inlets, and a sediment barrier downhill of ground-disturbing activities.

Typical items that will be conditions of approval on the permit are:

1. Obtain permit for and cap the sanitary sewer at the property line in an approved manner. Call for an inspection prior to covering.
2. The applicant is responsible for disconnecting utilities prior to commencing work.
3. If the property is vacant for a period of 180 days following demolition of the structure(s), the driveway approaches are required to be removed and restored to standard curbing. A separate permit is required.
4. Additional permits may be required for decommissioning of underground storage tanks.
5. Unless other arrangements are made, the water meter will be removed.
6. Call for final inspection of the site when all conditions have been met.
7. Prior to commencing work, all demolition and renovations are required to meet the State DEQ regulations regarding the handling and disposal of asbestos materials. This is a separate process. Contact the State DEQ Salem office at 1-800-349-7677 regarding asbestos survey and abatement requirements. Information is also available online at: www.deq.state.or.us/aq/asbestos

* This information is required to provide credits for future development related impact fees.

Potential Sequencing of Collaboration Residential Demolition Recommendations

Phase 1

- Increase demolition permit fee to cover costs of processing increased demolition permit requirements.
- Require a 35 working day notice (to neighborhood associations and posted on-site) prior to demolition permit issuance to and require the owner to offer the structure to be acquired and moved by a willing party.
- Define demolition as “the complete destruction or removal of a residential structure, or the removal of more than 50% of the perimeter walls.
- Require that the owner of the property proposed for demolition offer the property for purchase and relocation for a period of 35 days with requisite notice.
- Establish a registry of persons and businesses for notification of whenever a demolition permit is submitted for a single family residential property.
- Require that notice be given regarding DEQ requirements for hazardous materials abatement.
- Require that City and DEQ contact information be posted at a demolition site.
- Require that prior to demolition, the owner provides photos of the façade of the structure.

Phase 2

- Consider what incentives might be provided to a property owner to assist in rehabilitation or relocation of the structure.
- If moving is not an option, consider a requirement that a percentage of the non-hazardous materials remaining be diverted from landfills or reused.

Corvallis Climate Action Plan Task Force Scope of Work

1. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL INFORMATION

This Scope of Work is submitted on July 22, 2014 by the Corvallis Climate Action Task Force to the City of Corvallis Urban Services Committee. It covers work to be completed during Phase I (see Section 3. Timeline), beginning July 22, 2014 and ending December 31, 2014.

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Climate Action Plan Task Force (CAPTF) is a collection of civic volunteers interested in developing a climate action plan for the Corvallis community. CAPTF members participate as individuals or as representatives of the Sierra Club, 350 Corvallis, the Corvallis Sustainability Coalition, the Citizens Climate Lobby, the Climate Reality Project, the League of Women Voters, local faith community environmental stewardship groups, and other organizations.

PROJECT PURPOSE

The CAPTF encourages the Corvallis City Council to follow up the community greenhouse gas inventory that was recently completed by city staff with a climate action plan that sets significant greenhouse gas reduction goals and identifies strategies and actions to move the City toward those goals.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Given that City staff resources are limited, the CAPTF proposes to begin developing a community climate action plan for adoption by the Corvallis City Council. The process would include, but is not limited to:

1. Conducting research on topics related to development of the CAP, including:
 - Municipal- and state-level climate and energy plans from across the nation.
 - City of Corvallis policies and plans that could be built upon or identified for revision.
 - Other groups working in related areas with which the CAPTF might collaborate.
 - Relative costs and benefits of actions to provide evidence that the priorities included in the plan are the best places for our community to take action.
2. Identifying topic specialists from across the community and region who can provide technical information, identify and prioritize strategies and actions, and detail how individual actions might be implemented.

3. Writing a draft CAP based on the attached outline.
4. Checking in regularly with the City Council and its Committees and with relevant City boards and commissions to discuss progress and solicit feedback.
5. Conducting public outreach, including holding forums to engage community members interested in climate and energy challenges related to the topic areas in the CAP.

The CAPTF will seek to draft the CAP such that it expresses the urgency for integrated climate action at the local level, led by local government in partnership with business and civil society. CAPTF members recognize that climate action is an effort the entire community needs to support and act on, not just something that the local government adopts and implements. Progress on climate change depends on everybody modifying their behaviors and habits.

That said, local governments have the leading role in many areas, such as guiding local land use policies; shaping new development; strengthening building codes; investing in transportation systems and infrastructure; working with utilities; and managing parks, urban forests, natural areas, and watersheds. In addition to eventual adoption of the CAP, we would expect the City of Corvallis to commit to:

- Integrating CAP strategies and actions into City operations and existing plans (e.g., Transportation Master Plan, Comprehensive Plan, Economic Development Plan).
- Evaluating and reporting on community carbon emissions, re-examining goals, and identifying new actions on a regular basis (timeline to be determined during the CAP work process).
- Devoting staff resources as required to accomplish the above tasks and to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

STATUS REPORTS

Using the Corvallis Infill Task Force as a model, all CAP meetings will be public. Meeting announcements, agendas, and minutes will be published in public online forums.

The CAPTF will make available work completed so far and prepare a more detailed work plan to present to the City Council and/or USC for feedback.

3. TIMELINE

This Scope of Work covers work to be completed during Phase I. Phase II is included for information only.

MILESTONES

PHASE I

2014 July—Determine how the CAP Task Force will work with the City Council and staff.

August/September—CAPTF completes basic framework of a CAP (see outline attached) with short-term goals and actions for the following topic areas:

- Buildings and Energy
- Consumption and Solid Waste
- Food and Agriculture
- Health and Social Services
- Land Use and Transportation
- Urban Natural Resources

October—Community meeting(s) to provide information about climate action plan to the public and to receive public input.

November—Submit CAP to City Council for adoption and integration into updates to 2020 Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and Council Goals/Priorities.

PHASE II

2015 January–March—Submit CAP implementation proposal to City Council to consider as a goal for 2015-2016 term.

January-September—Work with community experts, CAP Advisory Committee, and public to set 2030 reduction targets and to develop long-term strategies and actions to meet those targets.

January-December—Attend City meetings where policies and planning documents are discussed to support incorporating climate action into updates.

4. EXPENSES

The CAPTF is not requesting specific City staff support at this time, nor is it requesting reimbursement for expenses incurred in the course of delivering the services outlined in this SOW.

The CAPTF would appreciate the waiving of fees for the use of City meeting rooms should their use be required for meetings related to the development of the CAP.

Climate Action Plan Outline

Executive Summary

Introduction

- Purpose and Scope
- Climate Action in Corvallis
- Sources of Carbon Emissions
- Climate Action Plan Development
- Corvallis Climate Action Plan Process

Vision for 2030

The Plan: Objectives and Actions

1. Buildings and Energy
2. Consumption and Solid Waste
3. Food and Agriculture
4. Health and Social Services
5. Land Use and Transportation
6. Urban Natural Resources

Community Engagement

Appendices:

1. Climate Change Overview
2. The Policy Context of Climate Planning
3. Assumptions in Calculating Expected Emissions
4. Emissions Inventory Methodology