



Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Summary Memo

October 19, 2022

Working Group Attendees (24)

City & County of San Francisco Staff (7/9)

Invited

Judson True, *Director of Housing Delivery, Office of Mayor Breed*
Lisa Gluckstein, *Housing & Land Use Policy Advisor, Office of Mayor Breed*
Raquel Bito, *President, Building Inspection Commission*
Neville Pereira, *Deputy Director of Permit Services, Department of Building Inspection*
Raymond Lui, *Structural Engineering Section Manager, San Francisco Public Works*
Dan Sider, *Senior Advisor for Special Projects, San Francisco Planning Department*
Liz Watty, *Director of Current Planning, San Francisco Planning Department*
Susan Ma, *Joint Development, Project Manager, Office of Econ. & Workforce Dev.*
Holly Babe Faust, *Construction Rep., Mayor's Office of Housing & Comm. Dev.*

Attended

X
X
-
X
X
-
X
X
X

Technical Experts (5/6)

Invited

Duke Crestfield, *Principal, Triangle Engineering*
Ned Fennie, *Architect, DBI Code Advisory Committee*
David Friedman, *Board Member, SPUR*
Sarah Atkinson, *Earthquake Resilience Policy Manager, SPUR*
Robert Kraus, *Structural Engineer, Structural Engineers Assoc. of Northern California*
Jenna Wong, *Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering, San Francisco State University*

Attended

X
X
-
X
X
X

Residential Building Owners (5/6)

Invited

Chris Cummings, *Dir. of Housing Development, Tenderloin Neighborhood Dev. Corp.*
Heather Lea Heppner, *Housing Preservation Mgr., Chinatown Comm. Dev. Center*
Janan New, *Executive Director, San Francisco Apartment Association*
Charley Goss, *Govt & Community Affairs Mgr., San Francisco Apartment Association*
George Orbelian, *Building Owner, 640 Mason Street*
Freeda Rawson, *Associate Director of Resident Services, Mercy Housing California*

Attended

X
X
X
X
X
-

Commercial Building Owners (2/3)

Invited

Alex Bastian, *Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco*
David Harrison, *Government & Public Affairs Manager, BOMA San Francisco*
Lisa Yergovich, *Principal, Architectural Resources Group (on behalf of BOMA SF)*

Attended

-
X
X

Tenant Representatives (0/3)

Invited

Attended

Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Agenda

<i>John Elberling, Executive Director, Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium</i>	-
<i>Raquel Redondiez, Director, SoMa Pilipinas</i>	-
<i>Fred Sherburn-Zimmer, Executive Director, Housing Rights Committee of SF</i>	-

Business Representatives (2/3)

<u>Invited</u>	<u>Attended</u>
<i>Rodney Fong, President & CEO, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce</i>	X
<i>Emily Abraham, Dir. of Legislative & Community Affairs, SF Chamber of Commerce</i>	X
<i>Johnny Jaramillo, Executive Director, PlaceMade</i>	-

Labor Representatives (1/1)

<u>Invited</u>	<u>Attended</u>
<i>Rudy Gonzalez, Secretary-Treasurer, SF Building & Construction Trades Council</i>	X

Builders & Developers (2/3)

<u>Invited</u>	<u>Attended</u>
<i>Matt Field, President, TMG Partners</i>	X
<i>Gregory Johnson, Associate Director, CBRE</i>	X
<i>Brian Main, Vice President, Construction Manager, Plant Construction</i>	-

Project Team Attendees (13)

Office of Resilience & Capital Planning (6), Project Lead

Douglas Legg, Deputy City Administrator, City Administrator's Office
Sophie Hayward, Director of Legislation & Public Affairs, City Administrator's Office
Brian Strong, Chief Resilience Officer
Melissa Higbee, Resilience Program Manager
Laurel Mathews, Senior Earthquake Resilience Analyst
Alex Morrison, Resilience GIS Analyst

Applied Technology Council (3), Technical Lead

Joe Maffei, Project Technical Director
Karl Telleen, Project Technical Team Member
David Bonowitz, Project Technical Team Member

CivicMakers (4), Engagement Lead

Judi Brown, Project Director & Lead Facilitator
Mike King, Project Manager
Brittany Henry, Assistant Project Manager & Facilitator
Terri Feeley, LBE Subcontractor & Facilitator

Meeting Purpose

Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Agenda

1. Build a shared understanding of program goals, constraints, strategy and team roles.
2. Build a foundation of knowledge about the critical technical issues involved in retrofitting concrete buildings.
3. Build a shared understanding of working group roles and process for making recommendations.

Meeting Background Materials

1. [Concrete Building Safety Program Overview](#)
 2. [Stakeholder Working Group Roles & Responsibilities](#)
 3. [Stakeholder Engagement Summary Report](#) (July 2022)
 4. [Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety Report](#) (2010)
Recommend searching for the word “concrete” rather than reading the full report.
-

Meeting Summary

1. **Welcome & Introductions**

Project team and working group attendees convened virtually via Zoom. Brian Strong, Chief Resilience Officer, welcomed participants and provided opening remarks about the Concrete Building Safety Program. Working group members introduced themselves via chat. The group was posed the icebreaker question, “What is your favorite building in San Francisco?”, and their responses formed a word cloud. Twenty-four participants submitted 38 responses to the word cloud.

2. **Overview of the Concrete Building Safety Program**

Laurel Mathews, Senior Earthquake Resilience Analyst, presented an overview of the Concrete Building Safety Program. The presentation included a brief history of the Earthquake Safety Implementation Program, a description of the internal City project team and Executive Panel, and a timeline of stakeholder engagement activities as part of the program design process. Working group members were invited to ask questions and make comments following the presentation.

Working Group Questions:

Note: the language below in italics reflects the spirit of the dialogue but is not always a direct quote.

Q1. I am wondering how much we are tapping into learnings from the Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety (CAPSS) and Earthquake Safety Implementation Program

Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Agenda

(ESIP) to streamline the process we are working on now, as it seems there are learnings that could save time. For example, with current technology, we can geolocate everything.

A1. *Great point. We are very much building on former retrofit programs. We are looking for opportunities to leverage past insights, in addition to new technologies. Our focus is on structural issues. We will be looking to the Applied Technology Council and working group members to see if there are simultaneously non-structural issues that can be addressed.*

Q2. *Are you using the Building Occupancy Resumption Program (BORP) in this effort?*

A2. *Yes, we want to take advantage of BORP. There are 250 buildings in BORP, and a lot of that info could potentially be used here. We will need to speak with private building owners. We are trying to leverage all the information and resources available.*

Q3. *Do you have an overview of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) shake map and how it will affect city infrastructure?*

A3. *Shake maps feature prominently in the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan. We are looking at liquefaction as well as shake maps in everything that we do. We will continue to rely on our mapping resources, including infrastructure overlays, going forward.*

Q4. *How will this program dovetail into climate change initiatives? When we planned CAPSS many years ago, climate change was low on the radar screen, but it is a high priority issue now, especially sea level rise. I think we need to be prepared to compete for attention with climate change in a way that we did not before.*

A4. *The Office of Resilience & Capital Planning is working on climate change issues and is aware of the intersection/overlap. We are asking people to switch to energy efficient appliances while we are also asking them to do retrofits. Adaptation measures like the Port of San Francisco retrofit are half climate and half seismic. To some extent these are competing issues and messaging, but I am hoping that we can work together to make it easier for building owners to do both. There really isn't any other choice.*

Q5. *There were liquefaction mounds on Marina Green during Loma Prieta. How will sea level rise affect liquefaction and stability?*

A5. *Good point. These things are connected. I am aware of those liquefaction mounds. The climate issues are clearly very relevant.*

Working Group Comments:

Note: the language below in italics reflects the spirit of the dialogue but is not always a direct quote.

Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Agenda

C1. *Nature doesn't care how the building is being used.*

C2. *During the Soft Story Program, I asked first responders what they considered the biggest risk from an earthquake. They said flooding due to water pipes not being secured. They were more concerned about flooding than building collapse.*

C3. *There is an opportunity to use carbon fiber to retrofit concrete shear walls to reinforce many of the buildings.*

3. **Introduction to Concrete Buildings, Inventory & Vulnerabilities**

Joe Maffei, Project Technical Director, presented an overview of tilt-up and non-ductile concrete buildings. The presentation included a comparison of the two building types, why they may require retrofitting, the Applied Technology Council's plan for accomplishing the technical program components, and an invitation for working group members to attend a building walking tour on October 24, 2022. Working group members were invited to ask questions and make comments following the presentation.

Working Group Questions:

Note: the language below in italics reflects the spirit of the dialogue but is not always a direct quote.

Q1. *You mentioned the City of Berkeley is running its program with incentives. What do we know about whether they are having any success with those incentives. Are they considering moving toward a mandatory approach? Knowing that other options are out there, I can imagine policymakers will be interested in whether there are other ways to do things.*

A1. *The Berkeley program was catalyzed by available FEMA grant money, which is unfortunately limited to \$50,000 per building. That doesn't go very far. There is no requirement to retrofit but if you choose to do so, a building owner can get up to \$50,000. According to an August call with the City of Berkeley, only a handful of concrete building owners took advantage of the incentives. Many who requested had already been planning to do a retrofit. That level of resources doesn't appear to have been a big motivator of behavior change.*

Q2. *On multi-family residential buildings, do we have data on the number of units on those properties?*

A2. *We have some data on the number of units available for condominiums. We also have square footage which, to the extent it is accurate, may also give some sense of unit numbers.*

Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Agenda

Q3. *Has there been consideration of a municipal General Obligation (GO) bond to help pay for this work? It looks like the cost will be more than \$100,000 per apartment unit, significantly larger than for the Soft Story Program.*

A3. *We are looking at a lot of different opportunities for GO bonds. We did include bonds in previous programs, but property owners didn't take advantage because banks beat the rates. It is important to note that when we use GO bonds for private property, it reduces the value because they cease to be nontaxable. That said, we will be looking at a wide range of incentives. GO bonds have become oversubscribed but they need to be on the list.*

Working Group Comments:

Note: the language below in italics reflects the spirit of the dialogue but is not always a direct quote.

C1. *Add Lowe's and Home Depot to the list of concrete tilt-up buildings that we will want to access post-earthquake along with Grocery Outlet and Walgreens.*

C2. *Emphasizing safety can also be supported by outlining the cascading benefits of retrofit from a community resiliency perspective.*

C2. *I applaud the screening process that you have included in the proposed plan.*

C3a. *When we did the Soft Story Ordinance, it was helpful to provide clarity to building owners. Doing so brought contractors together to support better scaling and collaboration. It became a movement, which, in turn, made the process more efficient and economically viable.*

C3b. *I concur about the value of clarity. In a prior tilt-up retrofit process that I was a part of, when we came up with some design pathways – only some of which were prescriptive - it made the effort more plannable. Building owners knew what was ahead of them. That, however, is admittedly very hard to do with non-ductile concrete. But I think clarity will be valuable to make the program more palatable to the community.*

C3c. *With the Soft Story Program ordinance, once we had clarity on expectations, then many building owners tried to jump on and get ahead of the requirements. Our report should include what incentives there might be for voluntary early implementers and their experience.*

Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Agenda

C4. *We can also look at how work on roofs and basements can facilitate resiliency if retrofits on those parts of the building would minimize the need for displacement of tenants.*

4. **Working Group Purpose & Process**

Judi Brown, Lead Facilitator, reminded working group members of their role and mission, introduced community agreements to guide future group discussion, and facilitated a Four Directions exercise to help members learn about each other's work styles. Working group members self-selected into breakout rooms corresponding to their primary work style: North, South, East, or West. Breakout groups discussed the strengths...A representative from each breakout room provided a quick summary of their discussion for the benefit of the full group.

North. *There were four (4) of us in the group. We believe that perfection is the enemy of good. We are looking for tangible outcomes. The process needs momentum and a clear schedule to reach a conclusion.*

West. *We were the largest group (14). Maybe that is not a surprise given the disproportionate representation of engineers on the working group. We tend to see the utility of other work styles and the role they play in helping us get out of the weeds.*

East. *There were nine (9) of us in the group. We appreciate the active approach of the North, the detail brought by the West, and the South for sharing all the opinions. We are needed as the compass of the group. We are the whips in the organization.*

South. *We were the smallest group (3). We recognize that we aren't the only ones who care. We posed some great questions about how we can move the group more South. For instance, how might we meaningfully integrate the needs and concerns that we have heard from stakeholders when other competing priorities emerge?*

5. **Wrap Up & Next Steps**

Laurel Mathews reminded working group members about the report recently shared with them that summarizes what the project team heard during discovery interviews with program stakeholders earlier in the year. The notes and major themes from those interviews will be a primary driver of working group content and discussions in the future. Laurel reminded working group members about the building walking tour on October 24, 2022, and the next meeting scheduled for the afternoon of November 16, 2022. Brian Strong thanked everyone for attending and closed out the meeting.

Concrete Building Safety Program

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1 Agenda
