URM Policy Committee
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Introduction and Summary of Draft Recommendations
History

• Policy & Technical Committees formed 2008
• Technical Committee recommendations finalized 2011
• Policy Committee reconvened 2012
  • Charge: develop best program to implement retrofitting across the board
  • Developed Draft Recommendations
  • Last meeting – April, 2014
    • DPD/SDCI requested thoughts for Plan B concept
    • Policy Committee requested comprehensive survey
• Survey completed April 2016
Bolts Plus Standard

- Similar to standard adopted in CA jurisdictions
- Brace parapets, tie walls to floors & roof, strengthen very weak walls and floors
- Requires at least 2 “good” lines of resistance in each direction
  - Maybe add structural frame to strengthen a wall (“Bolts Plus, Plus Frame”)
Bolts-Plus Caveats (Technical Comm. Report)

• Goal to establish:
  • Cost-effective retrofit requirement
  • Reduce likelihood of collapse
• Protect lives of building inhabitants and those nearby
• Not expected to prevent all injuries, damage

• Expect damage reduction in minor/moderate events (Nisqually)
• Some buildings will not qualify for Bolts-Plus => more comprehensive retrofit
URM Retrofit Policy Objectives

• Discourage demolition and abandoned URMs

• Encourage retrofits beyond the policy’s minimum requirements

• Encourage early participation

• Make it easy for building owners to understand and for the City to implement

• Easier Permitting

• Build broad-based support

• “Reasonable” cost of retrofits
URM Draft Recommendations

Overview

• **Threshold for retrofit requirement:** Single family homes and multifamily with 2 or fewer units are exempt

• **Timeline for retrofit:** Based on key steps in the process and Risk Categories - Critical, High and Medium

• **Incentive options:** Options such as transfer of development rights programs, waiving permit fees, city program facilitator

• **Enforcement:** Penalties for noncompliance at each step

• **Financial incentives:** Options for financing retrofits – Subcommittee worked with experts
Preliminary Risk Categories / Timelines

- **Critical-risk**: schools and critical facilities (hospitals, fire stations, etc.) – 7 years to comply with a retrofit program
- **High-risk**: buildings greater than 3 stories on poor soil or URM with more than 100 occupants in assembly – 10 years to comply with a retrofit program
- **Medium-risk**: all other URM buildings – 13 years to comply with a retrofit program

### Number of URM structures by Risk Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th># Structures</th>
<th>Percent of URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**URM Policy Committee Draft Recommendations**
## Number of Years to Complete Retrofit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification to Owners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Approval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Retrofit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
- Critical Risk: 7
- High Risk: 10
- Medium Risk: 13
# URM Financing Options

## Minimizing the cost of retrofits
*Identify funding support options that property owners can access*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public/Non-Profit Ownership</th>
<th>Private Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMA/CDBG/other grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General obligation bonds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>10% building tax credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax abatement</td>
<td>Tax abatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving loan fund</td>
<td>Revolving loan fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDRs</td>
<td>TDRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E grants &amp; resources</td>
<td>A/E grants &amp; resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building owner contribution</td>
<td>Building owner contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education funding</td>
<td>Education funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## URM Policy Committee Draft Recommendations

- Minimizing the cost of retrofits
- Identify funding support options that property owners can access
Enforcement Concepts

- Use standard SDCI Notice of Violation (NOV) Process
- Strong Penalties - Increase the severity of fines if compliance is not attained in previous process steps
- Include notice to tenants when owner is not in compliance with program
- Post signs on retrofitted buildings and on internet
Columbia Outreach City Pilot

• FEMA Grant awarded to SDCI and OEM for a pilot outreach and education campaign in Columbia City

• To learn the most effective means of communication – flyers, big or small community meetings, one-on-one meetings

• Create an appropriate message to all audiences; infographics

• Tool kit and training for City staff
Pilot Outcomes

- Small group meetings were most effective for reaching all audiences
- POELs were most effective for reaching cultural groups
- Outreach based on a technical terminology created challenges for multi-language messaging
- Owners prefer more detailed information on statistics, cost-benefit analysis, and incentives; their desire for detail exceeded that of the general public
- Contracting with POELs is an added expense but very effective
- Whether the outreach is done by city staff or consultants, coordination time with the cultural leaders will increase budget over more traditional outreach.
URM Policy Committee Timeline

- December 6, 2016 – Reconvene URM Policy Committee
- 1\textsuperscript{st} quarter 2017 – 2 meetings to confirm or refine recommendations
- 2\textsuperscript{nd} quarter 2017 – final recommendations