Local Government Committee
May 5, 2005 meeting notes

Meeting Time/Place:
5:30 pm at EERI’s office (499 Fourteenth Street, Suite 320, Oakland, CA)

Attendees:
Marguerite Bello, Craig Cole, Keith Knudsen, Laura Samant, Roger Sharpe, Fred Turner

1. Soft Story Assembly Bill AB 304 (Hancock)

An updated version of the draft AB304 bill was handed out by Laura Samant. Laura gave an update of contacts made since the last meeting. SCEC was contacted but they have not yet decided whether to support the bill as they usually only address earth science issues. The EERI southern chapter was sent a copy of the legislation. Craig Cole sent a copy of the legislation to Andrew Adelman, Chief Building Official of the City of LA. He was aware of bill due to participation on the Seismic Safety Commission.

There was discussion that support might be found in districts with many apartments. Such as the Simi Valley/Santa Clarita/Glendale whose representative is Assemblyman Keith Richman.

It was also suggested that we ask Marshall Lew of EERI Southern Chapter if he could identify EERI members in various Senate districts and ask that they send letters of support to their representatives.

Arrieta Chakos informed Laura Samant that the bill should go through the assembly in the next week without a problem. It was Arrieta’s opinion that support is more important to occur when the bill comes up in the Senate, possibly in August.

2. Berkeley Soft story

A meeting was held by the City of Berkeley with the Property Owners Association reported Laura Samant. They are trying to get a meeting with the rent control board in June and plan to present the soft-story ordinance to Council in August. Laura Samant presented a handout portraying 4 prototypical soft-story buildings. The City would like to obtain an estimate of engineering screenings for these prototypes performed in accordance with Appendix 4 of the International Existing Building Code (IEBC). Craig Cole offered to provide his estimate.

Four hundred soft-story buildings have been identified in Berkeley. The ordinance currently is being written to require that the engineering screening be performed on each of these buildings. There was some question as to what was the objective of the screening. Marguerite offered to obtain clarification from Dan Lambert.

Discussion was held as to the upgrade criteria to which soft-story retrofits would be required to meet. In this discussion there was concern expressed of referencing documents that have not yet been adopted (for example the IEBC), as well as referencing documents that reference other documents that are no longer applicable (for example the 2003 IBC references the UBC). Apparently the 2006 IEBC will remove all references to the UBC. Also discussed were problems with referencing a code that is not as stringent as a currently adopted code.
3. **City of Albany**

An owners meeting is scheduled in Albany on June 1st to discuss the URM ordinance. SE qualifications had been solicited by the City with the intent to pre-qualify engineers who would be put on a recommended list. Qualifications were due to the City on May 9th.

4. **City of Martinez**

Marguerite had been contacted by the City of Martinez’s Dave Scola, City Building Official and Susan McCue, the City Economic Development Director. They are considering adopting a URM ordinance. Currently they have a voluntary ordinance but it has not had much impact. They are looking to move to a mandatory ordinance. They have 20 URMs owned by about 10 owners. None of the URMs has been classified as historically significant. The City is seeking the committee’s assistance in drafting an ordinance. Craig Cole and Roger Sharpe volunteered to meet with City administrators to discuss their experience on URM ordinances. Fred Turner volunteered to share the information that the commission has on the URM inventory with committee members.

A number of issues that may be pertinent to the City’s situation were discussed. Much of downtown Martinez may be in a flood plain. Mandatory seismic retrofits possible could trigger flood mitigation upgrades. Also seismic retrofits will likely trigger upgrades to the State Disability Standards, as made clear by a ruling by the California Attorney General.

5. **Single Family Homes**

Roger Sharpe handed out a one page white paper outlining the current actions of the “The Single Family Retrofit Committee” and future needs. The paper was suggested at the April 7, 2005 EERI NorCal Chapter Government Committee to initiate dialogue on how the work of the single family retrofit committee can be extended. In the paper, outlined the problem, the current work, and additional steps.

The paper was a good first cut. It was suggested that a discussion of the current use of the “Plan Set A” be added along with a discussion of, has the release with success or problems. Considerable discussion was held around what additional steps would be appropriate including the steps themselves and possible sources of funding to accomplish those steps.

Additional steps discussed included: (1) Advertise to a broad Bay Area audience that the retrofit plans are available, (2) developing a good set of training aides for training homeowners, contractors, and building departments.

A number of organizations may welcome the opportunity to promote, fund, and support such an initiative whose product is available and if utilized could achieve a significant safety impact. With the dawning of the ’06 centennial celebration, many entities will want to pick up projects, stories, and initiates around earthquake safety. Some of the possible funding sources include: PG&E, the Red Cross, and the California Earthquake Authority. Fred Turner mentioned that PG&E and the Red Cross were given a $1,000,000 to use for earthquake mitigation. Craig Cole mentioned that
he was asked to participate in one of the PG&E/Red Cross mitigation initiatives. Fred Turner also mentioned that the CEA has a project headed up by Keith Porter with CUREE’s wood frame project to map where single family home seismic retrofits would be cost effective.

It was also discussed how and who should be the point for soliciting financial support. ABAG would be in the best position to present the idea to the CEA and PG&E/Red Cross. It was felt that ABAG would also be the correct entity to prepare and perform training. EERI’s involvement in the process was felt worthwhile and that the whole concept should not just be passed onto ABAG. To ensure EERI participation was suggested that we recommend to the EERI board that EERI provide some portion of the funding.

ABAG had prepared training for home retrofits about 10 years ago. Committee members knowledgeable in the earlier ABAG training expressed a need for the program to be re-cast. It was expressed that the previous training was frequently used by contractors as a sales tool to owners.

Actions include: Discuss the above with Jeanne Perkins; Roger to discuss the above with his Single Family Retrofit Committee; try to set up a meeting with Nancy Kincaid of the CEA; Craig Cole to discuss with his contacts at PG&E/Red Cross.

6. Bay Area Seismic Mitigation

As a follow-up to the April 7, 2005 meeting Laura Samant handed out a draft document entitled “EERI-NC Top Ten Policy Priorities for 2005-2006” for discussion. There was considerable discussion as to what was the purpose of the list. The following purposes were suggested: (1) identify what are current best practices, (2) Suggestions of where energies should be focused, (3) a wish list, (4) to develop a consensus of the most important areas for mitigation.

It was discussed that the list should identify short and long term projects. It might also be a good idea to list known impediments to accomplishing an item. For example CASH is opposed to using school bond funds for seismic retrofits, likely due to their bias towards new construction.

Three of the items addressed school buildings. It was discussed that the best method to get action with the schools is to make contact with members of the PTA. These items should be addressed by the EERI-NC School Committee headed by Janiele Maffei.

Keith Knudsen recommend that a consensus of the top ten items be achieved by October 2005.

7. Next Meeting: The tentative date for the next meeting is Wednesday June 1st.