

City of Portland, Oregon - Bureau of Development Services

1900 SW Fourth Avenue • Portland, Oregon 97201 | 503-823-7300 | www.portlandoregon.gov/bds



River Community Advisory Committee (RCAC) MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, November 17, 2022, 11:00am – 12:00pm

Virtual Meeting: Members Attending Via Zoom

ATTENDANCE:

City of Portland Staff: (BDS unless otherwise noted)

	Gabby Bruya, Analyst I
\boxtimes	Jason Buerkle, Residential Plans Examiner
\boxtimes	Jason Butler-Brown, Engineering
	Supervisor – Site Development
\boxtimes	Jeff Gauba, Sr. Building Inspector - Zoning,
	Nuisance + Site Inspections
\boxtimes	Amit Kumar, Engineering Supervisor –
	Engineering Plan Review
	Michael Liefeld, Supervising Planner
	Zoning, Nuisance + Site Inspections
	Maureen McCafferty, Commercial Plans
	Examiner

	Ken Ray, Public Information Officer – Communications & Outreach
⊠	Kimberly Tallant, Principal Planner – Land Use
\boxtimes	Dave Tebeau, Mgr Residential Inspections
\boxtimes	Nancy Thorington, Analyst – Bureau Wide Projects
	Sean Whalen, Fire Inspector/Specialist; Portland Fire & Rescue
	Terry Whitehill, Mgr Bureau Wide Projects

Current Members:

	Bruce Broussard
\boxtimes	Terry Glenn, Chair
\boxtimes	Kelly Holtz

\boxtimes	Tim Larson
\boxtimes	Tom Lisch
	Bryrick Shillam

A. Meeting Minutes

Motion: Kelly made a motion to approve minutes from the following meetings: October 6, 2022;

January 14, 2021; and January 9, 2020. A vote was held. The motion was unanimously approved.

B. Potential Changes to Title 28 Charter Rule

1) Terry G. and Dave conducted a review of changes in the document.

2) 28.02.020 G. Boathouse

a) Terry G. expressed issue with overnight sleeping specifications in this item, since having a kitchen in a boathouse is fairly common. Terry recommends it be restated to read, 'a boathouse will not contain sleeping accommodations'.

3) 28.02.020 O. Dock

a) Terry G. remarked that we are excluding main walkway from definition of 'dock'. He instead suggests adding 'and main walkways' or, 'marginal or main pedestrian walkways'. Tim suggested we make sure any over-the-water development used as a walkway is covered by this language.

4) 28.02.020 R. Engineer of Record

a) Amit wondered if we really want a registered structural engineer, as this is a specialty. He suggested the language revert to original wording. This item will be noted for further discussion.

b) Jason Butler-Brown added he has a hard time picturing a floating structure qualifying under the requirements for this item. He shared details on what a special structure is about, and the group agreed it would be a rare occurrence. Also discussed was that all types of

engineers may be considered as 'Engineer of Record'.

5) 28.02.020 U. Floatation Device

a) Changes to the 'Float Structural Components' section were reviewed. Terry G. suggested adding 'to support the structure' in place of the section which continues with, 'that are used for structural support...'. He also suggested adding the term 'logs' to the structural components list of items. He suggested this sentence be reworded for clarification.

6) 28.02.020 V. Floatation System (Float)

a) This section listed questions from BDS staff about the 50% rule. Specifics of this rule were reviewed. It was mentioned that items such as 'floatation device' and 'components' should be capitalized.

7) 28.02.020 FF (Marina) + GG (Moorage)

a) Terry G. shared that we have an opportunity to clean these definitions up by combining them. He added that he is not sure we need to define them separately, as they are often used in combination and/or with no differentiation in the document. Dave wonders if Maureen would have input on whether these are treated differently.

b) Jason Butler-Brown shared that this language creates provisions for scenarios on hypothetical projects to fall under a clear category, which can then be leaned on for greater precision.

c) Terry W. shared that in descriptions of work, one or the other term would be used, since it provides better differentiation on specific projects.

d) The final consensus was to leave both definitions in the document.

8) 28.03.020 A. 7 (Permits and Inspections section)

a) Terry G. had questions regarding replacement language.

b) Terry W. shared that part of the issue is that some parts are attached to land which may require a building permit and do not have as much flexibility, versus items only floating on water. The most common situation would be fire escapes, which typically involve weld repairs, and require permits. These also involve Life Safety matters. It is difficult to differentiate if only focusing on structural components.

c) Wording related to repairs was considered as related to permit requirements. Terry W., suggested we focus on structural components, perhaps change wording to, *'replacement of deck with like materials when non-structural'*.

d) Amit confirmed that decking is always a structural element since it supports vertical loads.
e) Terry G. inquired about adding wording such as, 'any new alteration, and/or repair to 'structural components' of a gangway'.

f) It was noted that welds would require a special inspection.

g) Tim mentioned plans to follow up with the Harbormaster related to a recent walkway accident.

h) Jason Buerkle shared the following code reference in the Zoom chat:

105.2.1 Repairs. Application or notice to the building official is not required for ordinary repairs to structures. Such repairs shall not include the cutting away of any wall, partition or portion thereof, the removal or cutting of any structural beam or load-bearing support, or the removal or change of any required means of egress, or rearrangement of parts of a structure affecting the egress requirements; or shall ordinary repairs include addition to, alteration of, replacement or relocation of any standpipe. Note: Unless amended locally by a municipality under authority of ORS 455.020, the requirements of Sections 105.3 through 105.6 apply.

9) 28.03.020 C. 7 (Permits and Inspections section)

a) The group agreed that a definition is needed for an existing slip. Dave pointed out that moorages tend to expand, making this detail critically important. Kim explained that she had initially been the one to request this language be added.

b) Jason Butler-Brown noted differences between 'proposed' and 'existing' slip language. It was suggested this could be changed to 'permitted slip'.

10) 28.03.035 BDS Administrative Appeals Board: C

a) Terry G, asked that language in the first sentence be cleaned up and clarified. Kelly asked if the next sentence could also be edited to mention floating homes.

11) 28.04.020 Maintenance

a) Kelly inquired as to review for any items in Chapter 29 which don't fit or apply to this section. b) Dave asked if adding the word 'relevant' ahead of the listed codes would exclude any unapplicable elements.

c) Nancy will check with Mike Liefeld to gain clarification on this.

d) It was mentioned that this area also covers the specialty code question Tim had raised. relating to welds.

12) 28.05.010 Floating Structures – D

a) Kelly asked to confirm if this does not require permit. Nancy clarified that the language lists situations when a permit is needed.

b) Tim made mention of life safety requirements, specifically in relation to windows larger than 20x40" wherever it may fall in the code. He added that this should be referred to whoever writes the code.

c) Dave shared that egress was added to the code in the 1970's, so windows existing prior to this change are still allowed since the State and City codes allow for it.

d) Terry W. explained that we follow the building code: explaining size minimums and other requirements. This would be addressed under the building code. Dave shared that it is still common to make suggestions where voluntary improvements could be made.

e) Jason Buerkle referenced R310.2.1 in the Zoom chat.

13) 28.05.020 Moorages - B.2 Exception

a) Jason Butler-Brown shared that if an engineer is preparing a summary letter verifying replacement piles are adequate (and also requiring a stamp), along with an evaluation, they are performing engineering work. His question being, what is the engineer responsible for? Amit should be able to weigh in more on this.

b) Jason also suggested considering how the structural capacity is reflecting the geotechnical capacity.

c) Terry W. explained engineering requirements as involved in any capacity. Dave confirmed that engineering judgements happen frequently. Jason suggested possibly specifying that the engineer provides stamped documentation on equal or greater capacity. He also asked if we will consider some type of requirement on what building code the piling was sized for.

d) Tim expressed concerns about piling installations being brought up to current code. Kelly also feels strongly on pilings and ramps.

e) It was agreed that this area should be reworded for further review.

f) Jason highlighted the following components as being of the most importance: geotechnical, structural, and flood plain. Depending on the situation, these may trigger other requirements and additional project costs. Jason is willing to spend time recommending language around this.

g)Tim suggested changing this section to 'meet existing codes'.

14) 28.05.020 3. Walks and Walkways

a) The group reviewed and discussed this section and decided to revisit in the future.

Action Item: a) Terry W. asked Nancy to incorporate today's suggested changes into a new draft of Title 28.

Meeting adjourned 12:58 pm

Next meeting: TBD, the first week of December.