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1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Bailer called the Planning Commission Public Hearing to order at 6:30 PM on October 28, 2014 in the Library Meeting Room.

2. ROLL CALL

Present for roll call were Chairman Tom Bailer and Commissioners David Reggiani, Tom McGann, and Allen Roemhildt. Commissioners John Greenwood, Scott Pegau, and John Baenen were absent.

Also present were City Planner, Samantha Greenwood, and Assistant Planner, Leif Stavig.

3 people were in the audience.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

a. Variance Request for Ronald and Anne Winters

Bailer acknowledged the additional correspondence from Cindy Hjort.

M/Reggiani S/Roemhildt to recess.

No objection; meeting recessed.

Bailer called the Public Hearing back to order at 6:44 PM.

4. ADJOURNMENT

M/Reggiani S/McGann to adjourn the Public Hearing at 6:45 PM; with no objection, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved:

____________________________
Tom Bailer, Chairman

____________________________
Leif Stavig, Assistant Planner
1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Bailer called the Planning Commission Regular Meeting to order at 6:45 PM on October 28, 2014 in the Library Meeting Room.

2. ROLL CALL

Present for roll call were Chairman Tom Bailer and Commissioners David Reggiani, Tom McGann, and Allen Roemhildt. Commissioners John Greenwood, Scott Pegau, and John Baenen were absent.

Also present were City Planner, Samantha Greenwood, and Assistant Planner, Leif Stavig.

3 people were in the audience.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

M/Reggiani S/McGann to approve the Agenda. 
Upon voice vote, motion passed 4-0.
Yea: Bailer, Reggiani, McGann, Roemhildt
Nay: None
Absent: Greenwood, Pegau, Baenen

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Minutes of 9-9-14 Regular Meeting
b. Minutes of 9-24-14 Special Meeting
c. Minutes of 9-24-14 Work Session

M/Reggiani S/McGann to approve the Minutes as listed on our packet.
Upon voice vote, motion passed 4-0.
Yea: Bailer, Reggiani, McGann, Roemhildt
Nay: None
Absent: Greenwood, Pegau, Baenen

5. DISCLOSURES OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

a. DNR Public Notice
b. Email from Jerry and Vicki Blackler

7. COMMUNICATIONS BY AND PETITIONS FROM VISITORS
8. PLANNER’S REPORT

a. Second Street Parking

b. Platting

S. Greenwood introduced Weston Bennett, the new Superintendent of Facilities. She said that they just received the appraisals for the Mobile Grid lot and the Impound Lot, so those will be back at the December 9th meeting with proposals so they are out for 30 days. She asked how the commission felt about the Legal Briefings and Zoning Bulletins. After brief discussion, the commission indicated they could go either way.

S. Greenwood asked about the budget for the commission. There is currently $6,500 budgeted for the commission. Roemhildt and Baenen are both going to AML training session; that’s what the money is going towards. Last year Holly Wells, City Attorney, came to discuss variances. Staff want to keep the $700 for ink. Roemhildt said that they may have to train new commissioners in the coming year.

S. Greenwood said that the next Regular Meeting is on a holiday and she isn’t sure that they even need a meeting. If something came up, they could have a Special Meeting.

Stavig provided an update on the Roads Inventory item. He just got done updating the GIS with the subdivisions that had not been added for several years. The next step towards addressing is getting the road inventory fixed, a component of that will be changing street names for duplications.

Reggiani referenced the Second Street Parking memo attached to the Planner’s Report. He said that he sees how problematic it is with the angles. Coming up the hill from Council Ave. and turning right on Second Street; the first couple of spots are the worst. He asked what the Planning Commission’s role was when it came to parking? He would be interested in seeing the street go back to parallel parking. Randy Robertson, City Manager, talked about how they needed to do a survey first. Reggiani said he wanted to push this forward. Robertson said that this is a community decision and they want to solicit the commission and City Council’s opinion. Reggiani said if it needs to be a recommendation he would like to see that as an action item at a future meeting. McGann asked about the size of the sidewalk and if there was a way to decrease it. S. Greenwood said that they could look at it if they redo the road.

S. Greenwood explained the administrative plat process. She said that the administrative plats are a benefit to the City as they dissolve lot lines creating larger lots. Reggiani clarified that this was consistent with current code and did not require a change.

9. NEW/MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

a. Variance Request for Ronald and Anne Winters

M/McGann S/Roemhildt that the request by Ronald and Anne Winters for a variance from the required rear setbacks of 15 feet and side setbacks of 5 feet of the Medium Density Residence District for one foot setbacks for their garage be approved as contained in the staff report with the special condition that the variance shall be contingent on the final closing and purchase of the property.

McGann said that it was clear that Section A does not apply. Since all four conditions need to be complied with for the variance to be granted, that’s as far as they need to go. Reggiani said he agreed with the staff...
report and their analysis of the different conditions in the Suggested Findings and their recommendation to
deny it. **Bailer** asked if they denied the variance where would it leave the property owner? **S. Greenwood**
said they would still have the ability to purchase the property and they can appeal to the Board of
Adjustment for the variance. The purchase is not dependent upon the variance. She said it would eliminate
the sale that is currently in place unless they appealed and City Council overturned your decision. She said
that she is required to meet those four conditions, and if they want to go through the conditions and not
agree with the Planner, they don’t have to accept her recommendation.

**Roemhildt** confirmed that the lot next to the lot in question was nonconforming because of the front lot
line.

**Reggiani** asked if there would be a spot in the back of the house for the garage that would meet the
setbacks. **S. Greenwood** said that would not.

**S. Greenwood** said that the current financing company will not move forward with the sale without a
variance in place.

**Roemhildt** said that there is an exceptional physical circumstance that applies to the property with the fact
that the garage was accidentally placed on City property.

**Bailer** said that he would vote in favor of the variance and see where it goes. He said that the building is
there, the property is there, and it’s being used. His initial thought was that it’s being used, they aren’t
going to take it, they may as well get it on the tax rolls. **Roemhildt** agreed and said that where the property
is located is physical circumstance to pass the variance.

Upon voice vote, motion **failed** 2-2.

*Yea:* **Bailer, Roemhildt**

*Nay:* **Reggiani, McGann**

*Absent:* **Greenwood, Pegau, Baenen**

b. Disposal of a Portion of ATS 220

**M/Reggiani S/McGann** to recommend to City Council to dispose of a portion of ATS 220 which contains
the area of encroachment only by direct negotiation with the special condition that Ocean Beauty shall
incorporate the additional land purchased from the City in the required re-plat of Lot 1 Block 1 and a re-
plat of ATS 220 in that area.

**Reggiani** said that he reviewed it and it looks like the as-built that was recently commissioned found that
the building was a little bit off their lines. This looks like a straight-forward solution. **McGann** said he
agreed. **Bailer** clarified that Ocean Beauty was encroaching and asked what the difference was between this
and the **Winters’** lot. **S. Greenwood** said that for the **Winters** the commission recommended to sell to the
setbacks; City Council changed that to a foot from the building. Ocean Beauty is just asking to purchase
enough for their current and existing building.

Upon voice vote, motion **passed** 4-0.

*Yea:* **Bailer, Reggiani, McGann, Roemhildt**

*Nay:* None

*Absent:* **Greenwood, Pegau, Baenen**

10. PENDING CALENDAR

a. November 2014 Calendar
b. December 2014 Calendar

_Bailer_ clarified that Second Street parking would be on the December Regular Meeting.

_McGann_ said it was time to revisit Chapter 16. _Reggiani_ said he’s been frustrated that they did so much work on those codes.

_Bailer_ asked about the critical habitat note that was in the Planner’s Report. _S. Greenwood_ said she doesn’t feel like they can amend a public document, but they could put a footnote on it. _Bailer_ wanted to look at their options.

11. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

12. COMMISSION COMMENTS

_Roehmildt_ asked what Chapter 16 was. _McGann_ said Building Codes.

_McGann_ said he felt bad going against the _Winters_’ variance request, but he thinks it is the correct move. He recognized that if City Council had sold the _Winters_ all the land they would not have needed the variance, but he is glad they went the direction they did.

_Bailer_ asked _Bennett_ to introduce himself.

13. ADJOURNMENT

_M/Reggiani S/McGann_ to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 7:15 PM; with no objection, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved:

____________________________
Tom Bailer, Chairman

____________________________
Leif Stavig, Assistant Planner
November 6, 2014

Re: Cordova Airport
    Permit ADA-71656
    Public Notice

Enclosed is a Public Notice regarding a leasehold interest disposal of State land.
Public Notice is required by the Alaska Constitution.

We are sending you this copy for your information only; no action is required on your part.
However, you are welcome to post this notice in the public view.

If you have any questions, please call me at (907) 451-5201.

Sincerely,

Diana Osborne
Airport Leasing Specialist

jkb

Enclosure: Public Notice

cc: Robert Mattson, Jr., Airport Manager

Distribution:

Chugach Alaska Corp., 3800 Centerpoint Dr., Ste. 601, Anchorage, AK 99503-5826
City of Cordova, PO Box 1210, Cordova, AK 99574
Eyak Corporation, PO Box 340, Cordova, AK 99574

"Keep Alaska Moving through service and infrastructure."
PROPOSAL TO AMEND A STATE AIRPORT PERMIT: The Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities proposes to increase the area of Permit ADA-71656, Parcel D, H, and I, consisting of approximately 36.4 acres, at Cordova Airport to include Parcel K, consisting of approximately 4 acres; for a total of 40.4 acres, to expire July 1, 2016. Applicant: Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry. Annual rent: N/A. Authorized uses: non-aviation – Manage the harvesting of white spruce for personal use; issuing woodcutting permits and monitoring the harvest.

Written comments must be received by 4:30 p.m., December 8, 2014, after which the Department will determine whether or not to amend the lease. The Department’s decision will be sent only to persons who submit written comment or objection to the Department, at the address and by the date and time specified in this notice, and include their return address. Information is available from Diana M. Osborne, Aviation Leasing, 2301 Peger Road, Fairbanks, AK 99709-5399, (907) 451-5201. Anyone needing hearing impaired accommodation may call TDD (907) 451-2363.

The Department reserves the right to correct technical defects, term, or purposes and may reject any or all applications or comments.

BY:  

Penelope Adler, SR/WA, CM  
Chief, Northern Region Aviation Leasing  

DATE: November 5, 2014

PLEASE LEAVE POSTED AND FULLY VISIBLE THROUGH DECEMBER 8, 2014

Note: A person who removes, obscurrs or causes to be removed or obscured a notice posted in a public place before the removal date stated in this notice is subject to disqualification from receiving any lease, permit, or concession related to this notice.
November 21, 2014

State of Alaska
Department of Natural Resources
Division of Mining, Land, and Water
Southcentral Region Office
550 W. 7th Avenue, Suite 900C
Anchorage, AK 99501-3577

Public Notice
ADL 231942: Applicant: Trident Seafoods Corporation
Private easement for fish processing outfall line
Cordova, Alaska

Pursuant to Alaska Statue (AS) 38.05.850, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Division of Mining, Land, and Water (DMLW), Southcentral Region Office is considering an application to grant a private easement for ADL 231942, an existing outfall line from a fish processing plant in the city of Cordova, extending into Orca Inlet. The outfall line is located within the northwest quarter of Section 28 of Township 15 South, Range 3 West, Copper River Meridian, Alaska.

The purpose of the outfall line is to provide disposal of seafood processing wastes. The easement for the outfall line is expected to be approximately 1,100 feet in length and 30 feet in width, over State-owned and DMLW-managed tidal and submerged lands. The final easement area and location will be determined subsequent to DMLW’s receipt of a required as-built record of survey produced to DNR’s specifications. Please see the attached drawing for imagery of the proposed easement.

Members of the public and interested parties are invited to comment on this proposal. DMLW must receive written comments no later than 5:00 pm December 22, 2014. In order to be given full consideration, all comments should clearly explain the facts on which they are based and how they pertain to the proposed action.

Comments, questions, or requests for further information should be directed to the attention of Carol Hasburgh at the Southcentral Region Office, 550 W. 7th Ave, Suite 900C, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3577; email carol.hasburgh@alaska.gov; telephone (907) 269-7480, fax (907) 269-8913. Comments may also be received via the Online Public Notices Website at: https://aws.state.ak.us/OnlinePublicNotices/Default.aspx

The State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, or special modifications to participate may contact the TDD number at (907) 269-8411. Copies
of the Alaska Statute referenced above may be accessed on-line by searching the State of Alaska website at [www.legis.state.ak.us/folhome.htm](http://www.legis.state.ak.us/folhome.htm).

The Division of Mining, Land, and Water, Southcentral Region Office reserves the right to waive technical deficits in this notice.

/s/ Clark Cox, Regional Manager  
Division of Mining, Land, and Water  
Southcentral Region Office
Cordova’s First Bioswale

Using native vegetation to filter stormwater entering Odiak Pond

In an effort to improve water quality flowing into Odiak Pond, a type of vegetative filter called a bioswale was constructed behind the Cordova Community Medical Center. Runoff from the parking lot and street drains into and runs through the bioswale and into the pond during Cordova’s frequent rainstorms.

The stormwater runoff contains sediments and pollutants from streets, houses, and cars that can harm salmon habitat. Native plants such as columbine, iris, and willow are planted in the bioswale, and these plants are key to the bioswale’s success.

The native plants filter the water with their roots, extracting pollutants and successfully breaking down contaminants. The plants also stop sediment and debris from draining into the pond. The bioswale’s filtration process provides protection for the environment, allowing cleaner water to flow into the pond. Odiak Pond is spawning and rearing habitat for coho salmon, so keeping the pond clean is very important.

Copper River Watershed Project and its partners are continually working to restore Odiak for fish, wildlife and people, as a home as well as an outdoor space for community members and visitors to enjoy. By working to preserve Odiak watershed, we are also helping to conserve biodiversity of salmon stocks on the Copper River Delta, which is important to the long-term health of regional fisheries.

Youth Involvement

Students from Cordova High School and Bidarki Summer Camps helped to collect native plant seedlings from the Copper River Delta and transplant them into the channel to improve the ability of the bioswale to filter stormwater runoff. Students also created an educational sign that will be permanently installed by the bioswale to educate visitors to the site about how it works (flip over to see a copy of the sign).

The bioswale project was completed with help from the City of Cordova, the Cordova Community Medical Center, Alaska Plant Material Center, and local students and volunteers. Supported with grants from the Prince William Sound Resource Advisory Committee, U.S. Forest Service Chugach National Forest, U.S Fish & Wildlife Service, National Association of Counties Research Foundation, and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation 5-Star Restoration Program: Southern Company, FedEx and EPA.
Nature’s Filter

This garden, called a bioswale, works as a natural filter of dirt, gravel, debris, and other contaminants that are carried by stormwater run-off.

What a Bioswale Does
Stormwater run-off flows from hard surfaces such as rooftops, parking lots, and roads, and makes its way into local waterways during Cordova’s frequent rainstorms. Stormwater carries micro-pollutants from developed areas that are harmful to salmon habitat. By decreasing the amount of pollutants entering the pond, the bioswale will improve salmon habitat.

How it Works
Stormwater seeps through the plants and is absorbed into the ground. Large debris and sediments are trapped by plants while micro-pollutants are broken down through various chemical processes in the plants and soil.

Odiak Pond watershed provides spawning and rearing habitat for coho salmon. By preserving salmon habitat in Odiak Pond, we are helping to conserve biodiversity in the coho salmon populations around Cordova. Diversity of salmon stocks is vital to maintaining a healthy, sustainable fishery in the surrounding Copper River watershed.
Bringing Back Odiak

Odiak Pond and stream are still home to coho salmon, a resilient fish that has persevered in this watershed as the community of Cordova has grown up around it. In July, 2014, remnants from the Copper River/Northwest Railroad were removed and an open stream channel was re-established.

The goals of this restoration effort were to support unimpeded movement of juvenile and adult fish, in particular coho salmon, between spawning and rearing habitat and to help return a more natural flow of water through the watershed.

With the assistance of the City of Cordova, the National Civilian Conservation Corps Gold 7 crew and the expertise of the U.S. Forest Service, the old railroad materials were removed using minimal heavy equipment. Dormant willows that had been collected earlier in the year by Cordova High School students were used for brush-layering, a technique developed by Alaska Department of Fish & Game for quickly re-establishing stream banks.

We wish to celebrate this community partnership that has resulted in on-the-ground results for coho salmon -- improvement of their habitat right in the heart of Cordova. This restoration work will provide educational and recreational opportunities for the community of Cordova for generations to come and will help sustain local coho populations by protecting the genetic diversity of individual stocks.

BEFORE...

The trees in the middle of this photo are growing through and around the old railroad trestle. An old wooden culvert connects the stream to the pond.

...AFTER

By removing the old culvert the stream is able to flow freely into the pond.
The site was cleared of trees and excavation with hand tools revealed the upper layers of the railroad trestle.

Come-alongs and griphoists were used to remove the top layer, and a backhoe helped remove the buried materials.

Tons of creosote-soaked lumber were removed. Cutting it into manageable chunks revealed the wood had barely deteriorated in the over 100 years it had stood in place.

Coir logs were used to anchor the toe of the bank, and brush-layering with dormant willows was used to re-establish the stream banks. Picture of completed project on other side!

This restoration project was facilitated by the Copper River Watershed Project (CRWP) under award NA11NMF4380268 from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, administered by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. CRWP also wishes to thank Gabrielle Brown, the City of Cordova, Alaska Forum on the Environment, the Erbey family, the Native Village of Eyak, Americrops NCCC Gold 7crew, Trident Seafoods, and the U.S. Forest Service Cordova Ranger District for their assistance and support.
Planner’s Report

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 12/4/14
Re: Recent Activities and Updates

- Two building permits issued since last Planning Commission Regular Meeting.
- CTC skill hill lease will be effective January 1.
- Safe Routes to School contract passed City Council; project will begin in May 2015.
- UV equipment RFP passed City Council and design is moving along.
- Tom McGann and Scott Pegau were re-appointed to the board.
- Impound will move to the Mile 17.
- City purchase of Church’s property should be completed by January 1.
- Winters property purchase is moving forward.
- Dialog with PWSSC on fill lot and contract.
- Presented recycling changes to CC and will be implementing changes this month.
- Completed budgets and working through fine details.
- Staff added a footnote to the ‘Summary of 3 Community Meetings for the South Fill Commercial Area’ document. To view the change in the context of the entire document, go to this link:


Waterfront/ SFLA Goals
The overall refined goals for the waterfront area, including the SFCA are:
- Improve waterfront access to both residents and visitors.
- Create a visually attractive waterfront business district.
- Compliment and contribute to the vitality of the downtown area.
- Improve the strength and diversity of Cordova’s economy.
- Create a safe and pedestrian-friendly waterfront.
- Consider and protect critical habitat.¹

Project Consideration Criteria
- Meet the overall goals and will align with other waterfront planning/development efforts/projects.
- Economically feasible - available capital and long-term operation cost and maintenance.

¹ This goal is not intended to designate any area as a critical habitat, nor is this area at the time of this writing designated as critical habitat by federal, state, or city agencies.
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 12/4/14
Re: Site Plan Review – Harborside Pizza

PART I – GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Actions: Site Plan Review
Applicant: Carbon Neutral Alternatives
Owner Name: Harborside Pizza
Address: 131 Harbor Loop Rd.
Legal Description: Lot 8, Block 2, South Fill Development Park
Parcel Number: 02-473-144
Zoning: Waterfront Commercial Park District
Lot Area: 12,986 sq. ft.
Attachments: Attachment A: Location Map
Site Plan Review Application
Construction Documents

PART II – BACKGROUND

Carbon Neutral Alternatives is proposing to construct a 1,352 sq. ft. building for Harborside Pizza on the existing foundation.

PART III – REVIEW OF APPLICABLE CRITERIA & SUGGESTED FINDINGS

Chapter 18.39 ZONING – WATERFRONT COMMERCIAL PARK DISTRICT

The development of an eating and drinking facility is a permitted principal use.
A Site Plan Review is required in the Waterfront Industrial District.

Chapter 18.42 ZONING – SITE PLAN REVIEW – Purpose.

Whenever required by this code or the city council, a site plan review shall be completed by the planning commission with a recommendation to the city council. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the city council must approve the site plan for the project.

Chapter 18.48 ZONING – OFF-STREET PARKING, LOADING AND UNLOADING

Eating and drinking establishments require “one space for each employee of the largest shift, plus one space for each ten seats.” According to the submitted plans, the maximum number of employees in the kitchen is two, and the maximum for the dining room is 20 for a total of four required parking spaces. The site plan contains six.

PART IV – SUGGESTED SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The Planning Department must be in receipt of a Plan Review from the State of Alaska Fire Marshal prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
2. Carbon Neutral Alternatives will consult with the Public Works Department to install a water meter and backflow preventer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

PART V – STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the Site Plan Review requested by Carbon Neutral Alternatives to construct a 1,352 sq. ft. building for Harborside Pizza on Lot 8, Block 2, South Fill Development Park based on the findings and with the special conditions as contained in the staff report.

PART VI – SUGGESTED MOTION

“I move that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the Site Plan Review requested by Carbon Neutral Alternatives to construct a 1,352 sq. ft. building for Harborside Pizza on Lot 8, Block 2, South Fill Development Park based on the findings and with the special conditions as contained in the staff report.”
ATTACHMENT A
# Building Permit Application

**City of Cordova, Alaska**

## Instructions
Print or type requested information. Incomplete applications will be returned to the applicant and will delay issuance of the permit. The Building Permit Application also serves as an application for a Zoning Compliance Certificate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Building Permit</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Building Permit</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Building Permit</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Building Permit</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>CARSON, NEUTRAL ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>P.O. Box 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip:</td>
<td>CORDOVA, ALASKA 99574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>(928) 699-6561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td>CWW.ALAASKA @ GMAIL.COM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Owner Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>HARRYSIDE PIZZA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>P.O. Box 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip:</td>
<td>CORDOVA, ALASKA 99574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>(907) 424-3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td>HARRYSIDE.PIZZA @ GMAIL.COM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If different from applicant.*

## Contractor Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Name &amp; License No.:</th>
<th>CARSON, NEUTRAL ALTERNATIVES # 8396</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Name &amp; License No.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Name &amp; License No.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Name &amp; License No.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List all contractors working on project. Contractors must have a Cordova Business License.*

## Project Information

| Scope of Work:                 | NEW CONSTRUCTION ON EXISTING FOUNDATION |
| Construction Start Date:       | ESTIMATED                                |
| Estimated Cost:                |                                        |

## Property Information

| Address:                        | 131 HABECK LOOP RD, CORDOVA, ALASKA 99574 |
| Legal Description:              | Lot 8, Block 2, South Fill Development Park |
| Tax Lot No.:                    | 02-473-144                                 |
| Zone District:                  | Waterfront Commercial Park District       |

*Planning Department can fill out if unknown.*
## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

**Describe Scope of Work in detail:**

- NEW CONSTRUCTION OF **HARBORSIDE**
- *Pieza to take place on existing foundation. Traditional wood framing with one-way sloped roof.*

**Dimensions, height, and square footage of construction:**

- **Building footprint = 34' x 56' = 1,904 sq ft**
- **Total height = 16'**

**Existing off-street parking spaces:**

- 6 including 1 ADA

**Proposed off-street parking spaces:**

- 6 including 1 ADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required zoning setbacks:</th>
<th>Proposed setbacks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front: 15'</td>
<td>Front: 24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear: 12'</td>
<td>Rear: 25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left: 5'</td>
<td>Left: 25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right: 5'</td>
<td>Right: 16'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required zoning height:**

- 16'

## OTHER QUESTIONS*

- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Will you be installing a private septic system?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Are you developing a new driveway that exits onto a State Road?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Does property contain drainages, creeks, wetlands, or other water features?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Will you be using fill to develop the lot?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Is this Building Permit for a Mobile Home?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Is the property within a Flood Plain?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Is your property within the Eyak Lake Area Meriting Special Attention?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Do you intend to get a Sales Tax Exemption Card ($150)?
- **Yes** ☐ **No** ✗ Do you need to have a Site Plan Review (Zones WCP or WI)?

*See Planning Staff for additional information if you don’t understand any of these questions.

## ATTACHMENTS

**For new construction or substantial changes:**

- Detailed Plot Plan
- Front Elevation Drawing
- Side Elevation Drawing

**Recommended:**

- As-Built Survey
- Photos

**Additional Permits:**

- Fire and Life Safety Review

**Residential building larger than a three-plex or any Commercial or Industrial building:**

- Other:

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I (we) certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my (our) knowledge, true and accurate. Furthermore, I (we) hereby authorize the City and its representatives to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting necessary site inspections.

**Applicant Signature:** [Signature]

**Date:** 11/9/14

**Print Name and Title:** Lacy Amy Schmid - Partner
HARBORSIDE PIZZA
CORDOVA, ALASKA

CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT SET

Project No. 13046.01

PDC INC
2700 GAMBELL STREET SUITE 500, Anchorage, Alaska 99503

RSA ENGINEERING INC
2522 ARCTIC BOULEVARD SUITE 200, Anchorage, Alaska, 99503

RSA ENGINEERING INC
2522 ARCTIC BOULEVARD SUITE 200, Anchorage, Alaska 99503

Structural Engineering
Mechanical Engineering
Electrical Engineering
**Room Finish Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Ceiling</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>WW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Door Schedule**

| No. | Size | Door Type | Fire | Smoke | Color | Code | Type | Fire | Smoke | Color | Code | Type | Fire | Smoke | Color | Code | Type | Fire | Smoke | Color | Code | Type | Fire | Smoke | Color | Code | Type | Fire | Smoke | Color | Code |
|-----|------|-----------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| 1   |      |            |      |       |       |      |      |      |       |       |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |      |       |      |      |

**Window Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window Opening Size</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6' x 8'</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6' x 8'</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Glass Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass Type</th>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>General Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1. W: IG Front Glass Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2. F: Factory Finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3. P: Panel Glass Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partition Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>General Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. W: Wood Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. W1: Wood Panel with Sliding Door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. W2: Wood Panel with Casement Door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. W3: Wood Panel with French Door</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Door Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door Type</th>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>General Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. D: Door with Glass Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. D1: Door with Clear Glass Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. D2: Door with Frosted Glass Panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Door Frame Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door Frame Type</th>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>General Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. D: Door Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. D1: Door Frame with Glass Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. D2: Door Frame with Clear Glass Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. D3: Door Frame with Frosted Glass Panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Door General Notes**

1. Width of door opening shall be measured from finished wall to face of door frame or casing.
2. Doors shall be fire-rated as specified.
3. All doors shall have a 30-minute fire rating.

**Door Remarks Legend**

- A: Anthony Silver
- B: Brown
- C: Copper
- D: Door with Glass Panel
- E: Clear Glass Panel
- F: Frosted Glass Panel
- G: Wood Panel
- H: Wood Panel with Sliding Door
- I: Wood Panel with Casement Door
- J: Wood Panel with French Door
- K: Wood Panel with Glass Panel
- L: Wood Panel with Clear Glass Panel
- M: Wood Panel with Frosted Glass Panel

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

DECEMBER 9, 2014
PLUMBING FIXTURE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FLUSH</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>NEXT</th>
<th>DRAIN</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>COLOR/TYN</th>
<th>INSTALLER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>WATER CLOSET - FLOOR MARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>WATER CLOSET - 4&quot; - FLOOR MARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3</td>
<td>WATER CLOSET - 8&quot; - FLOOR MARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOHLER</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-4</td>
<td>WATER CLOSET - 8&quot; - FLOOR MARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CEDAR RIDGE</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5</td>
<td>WASH BOWL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6</td>
<td>WASH BOWL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KOHLER</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-7</td>
<td>TUB - STANDARD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-8</td>
<td>LABORATORY SINK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-9</td>
<td>ICE MACHINE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMERICAN STANDARD</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WATER HEATER SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEDIA</th>
<th>FUEL</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>DESIGNED</th>
<th>HOT WATER</th>
<th>HEAT</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WH-1</td>
<td>BOILER</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXANSION TANK SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>HEATING</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>TANK VOLUME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET-1</td>
<td>EXPANSION TANK</td>
<td>HOT WATER</td>
<td>STEEL</td>
<td>20 GALLONS</td>
<td>20 GALLONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TANK SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>TANK CAPACITY</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>READY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT-1</td>
<td>TANK</td>
<td>STEEL</td>
<td>20 GALLONS</td>
<td>8&quot; X 12&quot;</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUMP SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>PUMP TYPE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>PUMP</td>
<td>STEEL</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>DOUBLE</td>
<td>READY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAN SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>1500 CFM</td>
<td>1500 CFM</td>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIR INLET/OUTLET SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>OPERATE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>EXHAUST</td>
<td>100 CFM</td>
<td>100 CFM</td>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEMPERING VALVE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>TEMP</th>
<th>FLOW</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>TEMPER</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CABINET UNIT HEATER SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>CABINET</td>
<td>STEEL</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAKE-UP AIR UNIT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-1</td>
<td>MAKE-UP AIR</td>
<td>STEEL</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOILER SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>BOILER</td>
<td>STEEL</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUEL FIRED UNIT HEATER SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>FUEL</td>
<td>STEEL</td>
<td>150 GALLONS</td>
<td>PROVIDE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MECHANICAL SPECIFICATIONS

HYDRONICS

- Shrink-wrap compression tanks: construction welded steel, rated for working pressure of 100 psi, with flexible pressure vessels, capacity pressures of 150 psi. According to pressure gauge and air differential pressure test, tank shall be filled with 150 psi. Pressure test, tank shall be filled with 150 psi. According to pressure gauge, tank shall be filled with 150 psi.

- Air-locks: normal or disc type, 150 psi, full pressure, oil, with flexible pressure vessels, capacity pressures of 150 psi. According to pressure gauge, tank shall be filled with 150 psi.

PIZZA OVEN VENTING

- The chimney shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-201. The roof shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-930. The roof shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-201. The roof shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-930.

APPLIANCE VENTING

- Island range hood: the chimney shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-930. The roof shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-201. The chimney shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-930. The roof shall be rated and meet the requirements of the 2015 edition of UL-201.

FUEL OIL TANKS

- Above ground fuel oil storage tanks: for furnishing a 150 gallon underground storage tank, which shall be filled with 150 psi. According to pressure gauge, tank shall be filled with 150 psi. According to pressure gauge, tank shall be filled with 150 psi.

SEISMIC RESTRAINT

- Seismic restraint: all equipment installed under this project shall be braced for a seismic event. Bracing shall be designed for seismic restraint. Design shall be designed for seismic restraint. Design shall be designed for seismic restraint.

INSTRUMENTATION / CONTROLS

- Steam temps: 100°F, maximum allowable pressure, 100°F, maximum allowable pressure, 100°F, maximum allowable pressure.

- Gas thermocouples: 90°F, maximum allowable pressure, 90°F, maximum allowable pressure, 90°F, maximum allowable pressure.

- Pressure sensors: 150 psi, maximum allowable pressure, 150 psi, maximum allowable pressure, 150 psi, maximum allowable pressure.

- Temperature sensors: 100°F, maximum allowable pressure, 100°F, maximum allowable pressure, 100°F, maximum allowable pressure.

- Flowmeters: 100°F, maximum allowable pressure, 100°F, maximum allowable pressure, 100°F, maximum allowable pressure.

- Boiler efficiency: 95%.

- HVAC system: When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency.

- Pumps: When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency.

- Sequences of operation:

  1. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency.

  2. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency.

  3. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency.

  4. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency. When the motor controller calls for heat, a variable valve shall be set to the manufacturer's recommended valve position for maximum efficiency.
NOTES:
1. CONTROLLED 30° TO ENHANCE EXIT LOSS FACTOR (EFL). MAIN EXIT TO BE CONTROLLED WITH EXIT AND EXIT SIGNAGE TO ENSURE THE OWNER COMPLIES WITH ALL LOCAL AND NATIONAL CODES FOR EXIT SIGNS.
2. PROVIDE COMMISSIONING FOR EXITS AND MAIN EXIT. COMMISSIONING EQUIPMENT WITH THE ENTRANCE TO THE COMMISSIONING PROCESS TO ENSURE ALL SYSTEMS ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CODES.
3. WANTED EXIT SIZE MINIMUM FOR EXIT EXTERIOR SYSTEMS INSTALLATION.
4. CONNECTION TO MAIN EXTERIOR EXTERIOR SYSTEMS INSTALLATION.
5. 3-SIZE 90° EXTERIOR EXTERIOR SYSTEMS INSTALLATION.
6. COORDINATE WITH OWNER FOR EXTERIOR EXTERIOR SYSTEMS INSTALLATION.
7. MANUFACTURER'S SUGGESTIONS FOR EXIT EXTERIOR SYSTEMS INSTALLATION.
8. EMERGENCY SHUT-OFF SYSTEM FOR BOTH SIZE, SEE DETAIL E-1012, FOR WIRING DIAGRAM.
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 12/4/14
Re: Review of Proposals for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2

PART I – GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Actions: Review Proposals and give a recommendation to City Council
Legal Description: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2
Parcel Number: 02-060-128
Zoning: Waterfront Industrial District
Lot Area: 8,267 sq. ft.
Attachments: Proposal Packet (The packet distributed to potential proposers)
Proposals: Nerka Enterprises
          Becky Chapek
          Native Village of Eyak
          Bayside Storage
          Prince William Sound Science Center

The public notice period for this property disposal began Oct. 30th and ended Dec. 1st at 10 AM. The City received five proposals for the property. The lot has been used by the City as an Impound Lot for several years. The City will move the impound lot to the landfill as it becomes necessary.

While the lot is 8,267 SF and the minimum lot size for the Waterfront Industrial District is 10,000 SF, the City is able to sell the lot. The City approved the subdivision of Lot 4 in 2001 thus approving two lots that did not meet the standard lot size for that zoning district. Any proposal for future development on the lot will be required to meet all the Waterfront Industrial code requirements except for the minimum lot size.

The proposed price from each proposal is as follows (minimum bid = $48,000):
Nerka Enterprises $48,500
Becky Chapek $54,000
Native Village of Eyak $48,000
Bayside Storage $50,400
Prince William Sound Science Center $70,000

PART II – APPLICABLE CRITERIA

Chapter 5.22 – REVENUE AND FINANCE – DISPOSAL OF CITY REAL PROPERTY – Methods of disposal for fair market value.
D. A request for proposals to lease or purchase city real property shall specify the criteria upon which proposals shall be evaluated, which may include without limitation the type of proposed development and its benefit to the community, the qualifications and organization of the proposer, the value of the proposed improvements to the real property, and the required rent or purchase price. All proposals submitted in response to a request for proposals shall be reviewed by the planning commission, which shall recommend a proposal to the city council for award.
PART III – SUGGESTED MOTION

“I move that the Planning Commission recommend City Council approve the proposal from __________________ to purchase Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2.”
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: _____________________________________________________________

Name of Organization:  _____________________________________________________________

Address: _________________________________ Phone #: ____________________
_________________________________ Email: _________________________
_________________________________

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2 is $48,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $ __________________

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney’s fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
Additional Information Required (please attach separately with this proposal form):

1. Describe the type of business you’re proposing to develop.

2. What is the proposed square footage of the development?

3. Provide a sketch, to scale, of the proposed development in relationship to the lot. (Attachment C)

4. What is the benefit of the proposed development to the community?

5. What is the value of the proposed improvements (in dollars)?

6. What is your proposed timeline for development?

Included for your convenience:

Attachment A: Criteria used when evaluating each submitted proposal.
Attachment B: A location map showing the subject property.
Attachment C: The property parcel with measurements.
Attachment D: Cordova Municipal Code - Waterfront Industrial District

Please mail proposals to: City of Cordova
Planning Department
C/O Proposals
P.O. Box 1210
Cordova, Alaska 99574

Or email proposals to planning2@cityofcordova.net. The email subject line shall be “Proposal for Lot 4A, Block 5,” and the proposal shall be attached to the email as a PDF file.

Or deliver your proposal to the front desk at City Hall.

For questions or more information about the land disposal process, contact the City Planning Department at 424-6220, planning2@cityofcordova.net, or stop by in person.

Proposals received after December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM will not be considered.
Each proposal will be evaluated on the criteria in the table below. Each criteria will be scored from 1-10. The multiplier will then be applied to the scores to determine a final score.

**Final Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area: 8,267 SF
Chapter 18.33 - WATERFRONT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

Sections:

18.33.010 - Purpose.

The following statement of intent and use regulations shall apply in the WI district:

The waterfront Industrial district is intended to be applied to land with direct access or close proximity to navigable tidal waters within the city. Uses within the waterfront industrial district are intended to be marine-dependent or marine-oriented, and primarily those uses which are particularly related to location or commercial enterprises that derive an economic benefit from a waterfront location.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.020 - Permitted principal uses and structures.

The following are the permitted principal uses and structures in the waterfront industrial district:

A. Marine sales;
B. Open wet moorage;
C. Covered wet moorage;
D. Passenger staging facility;
E. Haulout facilities;
F. Marine construction, repair and dismantling;
G. Cargo terminal;
H. Cargo handling and marine-oriented staging area;
I. Fish and seafood processing;
J. Warehousing and wholesaling;
K. Open storage for marine-related facilities;
L. Fuel storage and sales.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.030 - Permitted accessory uses and structures.

A. Bunkhouses in conjunction with permitted principal uses;
B. Residential dwelling for watchman or caretaker employed on the premises, or owner-operator and members of his family, in conjunction with permitted principal uses;
C. Retail business when accessory to a permitted principal use.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.040 - Conditional uses and structures.

Subject to the requirements of the conditional use standards and procedures of this title, the following uses and structures may be permitted in the WI district:

A. Log storage and rafting;
B. Timber and mining manufacturing.
18.33.050 - Prohibited uses and structures.

Any use or structure not of a character as indicated under permitted uses, accessory uses, or conditional uses.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.060 - Setbacks.

A. Minimum Setbacks.
   1. Front yard-Twenty feet.
   2. Side yard and rear yard: subject to Uniform Building Code regarding fire walls and separation of buildings.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.070 - Lot coverage.

A. Maximum lot coverage by all buildings and structures as regulated by the Uniform Building Code.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.080 - Height.

A. Maximum height of buildings and structures: subject to Uniform Building Code regarding building heights.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.090 - Off-street parking and loading.

A. Off-street Parking and Loading. The requirements for off-street parking and loading in the waterfront industrial district shall be as set forth in Chapter 18.48 of this code.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.100 - Minimum lot requirements.

A. Minimum Lot Requirements.
   1. Lot width: 100 feet;
   2. Lot size: 10,000 feet.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.110 - Signs.

A. Signs. Signs may be allowed in the waterfront industrial district subject to the supplementary district regulations, the Uniform Sign Code, as set forth in Chapter 18.44 of this code.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.120 - Floor elevations.

A. Minimum Finished Floor Elevations. In the waterfront industrial district, the following minimum finished floor elevations for the ground floor shall be adhered to:

   North Fill Development Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27.00′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>26.50′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>26.50′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>26.25′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>26.50′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>26.25′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>27.25′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>26.50’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>26.25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>26.75’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>27.25’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27.00’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>26.75’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>26.50’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>26.25’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The elevation datum used is based on the following described bench mark:

USC & GS Standard Brass Disk Located in Sidewalk Adjacent to Fish Game Building near Southwest Corner of Intersection Railroad Avenue and Breakwater Avenue. Elevation 40.40 Above M.L.L.W.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.130 - Site plan review.

A. Prior to the issuance of a building for construction within the waterfront industrial district, the planning commission shall approve the development plan for the project. The site plan review shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of this code.

B. The exterior siding and roof shall be finished in earthtone colors.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: GREG & EVA LOFORTO

Name of Organization: NERKA ENTERPRISES

Address: Box 865

Cordova 99574

Phone #: 424-5585

Email: lofortege@gmail.com

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2 is $48,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $ 48,500.00

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney's fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
Greg & Eva LoForte  
Box 865  
Cordova, Alaska 99574  
November 17, 2014  

City of Cordova  
Planning Department  
Re: Lot 4A Block 5 North Fill  

A. We propose to re-plat lots 4A & 4B to its original configuration which would eliminate the present condition of two sub-standard lots.  

B. We then plan to construct a metal sided building which would be very similar to the one on our existing property, 5/12 pitch roof, Beige siding, Red roof, 16’ doors and two or three man doors.  

C. We propose to lease/rent this building out to a business requiring such a structure. During the past 14 years we have had numerous requests to rent our existing building which we have done from time to time. (Inside heated storage after Copper River Seafood’s warehouse caved in, active net loft, rented out to local craftsman for fiberglass work, aluminum welding, installation of flush decks, vessel re-wiring, etc.) We believe that these requests have shown us that there is a definite need for a dedicated facility that would serve the Marine industry.  

D. The proposed building would be 40’ by 50’ which gives us 2000 sq. ft. of floor space. The estimated cost would be $130,000.00. There is possibility that a larger structure may be constructed. We would adhere to all of the required set-backs before considering this second option.  

E. Just a little background on terms: the City originally leased lot 4B to me for three years with the stipulation that I complete the proposed development plan within this time frame. This requirement was met one year ahead of schedule. At that time 1/2 of the lease price was applied to the cost of the property. We realize that times have changed so we would like to propose these payment options:
1) We would pay $48,500.00 to the city upon acceptance of this offer. The costs for re-platting would be at our expense. The City would be required to clean up the lot.

2) We would put 25% of the purchased price down and lease the property for three years with the stipulation that the project is completed within this time frame. This arrangement would only work for us if we were able to start work this next spring. I consider 2015 to be critical for ground work.

Thank you for considering our proposal and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Greg LoForte
## Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposal: _______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
DECEMBER 9, 2014

CITY OF CORDOVA

SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: Barry Chapel

Name of Organization: 

Address: P.O. Box 1564 
Cordova, AK 99574

Phone #: 424-5356

Email: 

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2 is $48,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $ 54,000

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney's fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
TO: City of Cordova – P & Z  
FROM: Becky Chapek  
DATE: November 30, 2014  
RE: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill

This lot would be purchased to facilitate the opening of a full service small boat repair shop. It will be open year round and will offer clients a warm, dry & pleasant place to do boat repair. There will be 4 bays with designated use attached to each unit i.e. - fiberglass work & painting - mechanical rebuilds – interior cabin & deck upgrades & general maintenance.

The building is approximately 3840 square feet with a 45’ X 80’ footprint. It will be an iron frame, steel clad building with a heated slab. An estimated cost is $342,500 for the framework, slab and building with interior upgrades and equipment adding an additional $287,500.

Preparation for the lot would be completed in 2015 so the foundation work could be poured before winter. In the spring of 2016, the building would be raised on the heated slab. Target date for opening is June 2016.

As a result of opening this business, Cordova’s fishermen will have an affordable, healthy place to do boat work. Having “survived” the deplorable options here for trying to do inside boat work especially during the winter, I can tell you this building will be used year round by people overjoyed by the existence of such a great option. It will provide year round employment for skilled craftsmen who in the past could not find a place to work. It’s also a great option for fishermen who cannot justify their own private shop, but need a place to work on their projects.

Although the result of this project will produce jobs & sales tax revenue that will benefit the City, I believe part of the worth in this proposal is intangible. Building something like this recognizes the need to have services that support the fleet. Allowing me to build this will enhance the City’s image as being supportive of the fishing industry and recognizes Cordova’s heritage as the base for area E fisheries. I believe it will prove to be a very valuable & much appreciated asset to our community.
Area: 8,267 SF
Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposal: _______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: Moe Zamarron

Name of Organization: Native Village of Eyak

Address: PO Box 1388  Phone #: 907-424-7738
          Cordova, AK 99574  Email: moe.zamarron@eyak-nsn.gov

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2 is $48,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $48,000

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney’s fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2, City of Cordova, Alaska.
Currently known as ‘The City’s Impound Lot’

1. The Native Village of Eyak (NVE) proposes to develop the above referenced parcel into a service facility providing an assortment of general repair, maintenance and upgrade tasks to the marine and land transportation industries. To address the growing needs of its expanding fleet of vessels and work vehicles it is necessary for NVE to make plans for a new facility that would adequately support in-house operations. While some amenities would be limited in use to NVE others would be made available commercially. Equipment has been secured that enables NVE to perform shrink-wrapping of vessels and equipment, perform tire repair for large trucks and heavy equipment and to provide general welding work. These services would be available to the public from this facility along with the rental of specialized equipment, with certain restrictions. Additionally, room would be made available for the storage of small vessels, equipment and supplies for NVE programs.

2. Taking final design criteria and code restrictions into account, NVE proposes to set the area of the building at the maximum allowed for the lot. Once the design team has considered all pertinent information a final footprint can be presented but initially this proposal shows a 60’ x 90’ building for an area of 5,400 square feet. Drainage, parking space counts, snow handling and setbacks all will have bearing on the building layout and may alter the final square footage of development.

3. See attachment ‘A’ for required sketch of proposed development.

4. Benefit of proposed development to the community. NVE operates a number of programs that bring direct benefit to the tribal members in the area and to the community of Cordova at large. Through the transportation, natural resources, wellness and housing departments NVE channels outside funding to Cordova that promotes health, affordable utilities and increased standards of living. The ability of NVE to house, maintain and operate equipment related to these programs offers two primary benefits for continued program development. First, this facility provides the means to keep program equipment functional, efficient and ready for use. This demonstrates to funders a level of competence and responsibility on the part of NVE in following through with the requirements of programs as expansion occurs. Secondly, the new facility provides potential funders with an accurate picture of NVE’s ability to build capacity through preparation and partnership development. Through this facility NVE will provide services that are not otherwise found in Cordova and do so at cost which reinforces local economic wellbeing and promotes cooperation between organizations.

5. The dollar value of the proposed development is estimated at $600,000.

6. The proposed timeline for development is to have an initial design ready by the 1st quarter of 2016 and have construction start in 2017.
Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposal: _______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: Paul and Linda Kelly

Name of Organization: Bayside Storage

Address: 350 Jim Poor Ave

P.O. Box 265

Cordova, AK 99574

Phone #: 907-424-3109

Email: akelly@ctcak.net

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2 is $48,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $50,400.00

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney’s fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
November 30, 2014

City of Cordova
Planning Department
C/O Proposals
P.O. Box 1210
Cordova, AK 99574

RE: Sealed Proposal for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development

Additional Information:

1. Type of business-Dry storage and small business operating space.

2. Proposed square footage: Approximately 2456 sq ft per floor

3. See provided sketch

4. Benefit to Community: Provides needed dry storage space, and business operating space for fishing industry and all community members. Approximately $6000/year in sales tax plus $6700 property tax. Bayside Storage employees 5.

5. Value of improvements: $450,000.00

6. Proposed timeline for development: 0-3 years
Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposal: _______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 9, 2014

CITY OF CORDOVA

SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: KATRINA HOFFMAN

Name of Organization: PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND SCIENCE CENTER

Address: 300 BREAKWATER AVE. Phone #: 907-424-5800 x 225
          PO BOX 705
          CORDOVA, AK 99574
          Email: khoffman@pwscc.org

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park Addition No. 2 is $48,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $70,000.00

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney’s fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
Property: Lot 4A, Block 5, North Fill Development Park

Name of Proposer: Katrina Hoffman
Name of Organization: Prince William Sound Science Center
Address: 300 Breakwater Avenue, Cordova, AK 99574
Phone: 907-424-5800 x225
Email: khoffman@pwssc.org

Additional Information Required:

1. Describe the type of business you’re proposing to develop.

This site will be developed as a portion of the distributed campus of a well-known research and education institution, the Prince William Sound Science Center. The building developed on this site will provide:
--shop space for marine equipment construction, repair, and dismantling;
--warehousing for equipment and supply storage;
--maritime oriented staging for research activities
--haulout and storage area for the multiple vessels owned by the organization, as dictated by vessel maintenance and storage needs
--bunkhouse space for employees and professionals with responsibility for using, constructing, repairing, dismantling, and/or organizing supplies and equipment of the business

2. What is the proposed square footage of the development?

The proposed square footage of the development is 2,400 square feet per floor at two stories for a total of 4,800 square feet. The site development plan also includes a lean-to structure that will provide covered storage outside the building. The lean-to has a 600 square foot footprint.

The maximum height shall not exceed that dictated by Uniform Building Code.

Off-street parking and loading is provided for as designated in the site plan.

3. Provide a sketch, to scale, of the proposed development in relationship to the lot.

See Attachment C.

4. What is the benefit of the proposed development to the community?

The benefits of the proposed development to the community are multiple. It will support an organization that has between 20 (year round) to 30 (high season) employees on staff at any given time of year. It will allow for the addition of an employee at an operations manager level. Construction of the facility will employ
local laborers and use materials from local vendors, generating sales tax revenue through direct purchases. Seasonal employees who stay in the bunk space will be within walking distance of the downtown core and will purchase goods and services in the community, generating sales taxes as well. Increased access to space for constructing, maintaining, and storing research equipment will attract research collaborations with individuals from organizations outside of Cordova. These collaborations will generate additional visitors to the community.

The importance to the community is high. These facilities are critical to the ability of PWSSC to carry out its water dependent and water related work, with an annual budget of $5,000,000 and over $100,000 per month in local payroll. Further, these facilities will enable PWSSC to increase the value of the annual work pursued and completed, enabling the hiring of one or more additional permanent staff and drawing multiple visitors from collaborating institutions to Cordova for shorter periods of time.

The building will be designed to represent the aesthetic of a classic fishing village cannery building. External trim will give it charm. A functional yet decorative balcony off the second floor will be constructed of handsome decking materials and will enable the display of planters that permit seasonal landscaping enhancements.

The center-peak roof of the building will allow snow to shed to both sides of the building. There is ample space purposefully left available for the movement and storage of snow on-site.

5. What is the value of the proposed improvements (in dollars)?

The value of the proposed improvements is $300,000.

6. What is your proposed timeline for development?

The proposed timeline for building completion is 12 months. Within 18 months, at least one new permanent staff member will be hired. Within 24 months, relationships will be established with partners that will draw collaborators to Cordova for research and education purposes.
ATTACHMENT C

Area: 8,267 SF

40' x 60' metal building

40' x 15' lean-to covered storage

Parking

Parking

Parking

Parking

Parking

Parking

20' setback

20' setback

20' setback

20' setback

37.77'
Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposal: _______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 12/4/14
Re: Review of Proposals for Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park

PART I – GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Actions: Review Proposals and give a recommendation to City Council
Legal Description: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park
Parcel Number: 02-060-136
Zoning: Waterfront Industrial District
Lot Area: 11,534 sq. ft.
Attachments: Proposal Packet (The packet distributed to potential proposers)
Proposals: Mobile Grid Trailers, Inc.
Trident Seafoods Corp.
Native Village of Eyak
Prince William Sound Science Center

The public notice period for this property disposal began Oct. 30th and ended Dec. 1st at 10 AM. The City received four proposals for the property. This lot has been leased to Mobile Grid Trailers, Inc. since 2003. Prior to the most recent lease term, City Council expressed an interest in putting this lot out for proposals. The last lease term, which expired October 19, 2014 and is now in hold-over, was for a period of 18 months in order to give Mobile Grid enough time to plan for the anticipated disposal process.

The proposed price from each proposal is as follows (minimum bid = $65,000):
Mobile Grid Trailers, Inc. $67,500
Trident Seafoods Corp. $90,000
Native Village of Eyak $65,000
Prince William Sound Science Center $100,000

PART II – APPLICABLE CRITERIA

Chapter 5.22 – REVENUE AND FINANCE – DISPOSAL OF CITY REAL PROPERTY – Methods of disposal for fair market value.
D. A request for proposals to lease or purchase city real property shall specify the criteria upon which proposals shall be evaluated, which may include without limitation the type of proposed development and its benefit to the community, the qualifications and organization of the proposer, the value of the proposed improvements to the real property, and the required rent or purchase price. All proposals submitted in response to a request for proposals shall be reviewed by the planning commission, which shall recommend a proposal to the city council for award.

PART III – SUGGESTED MOTION

“I move that the Planning Commission recommend City Council approve the proposal from ______________________ to purchase Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park.”
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: _____________________________________________________________

Name of Organization:  _____________________________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________ Phone #: ____________________

_________________________________ Email: _________________________

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park is $65,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $ __________________________

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney’s fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
Additional Information Required (please attach separately with this proposal form):

1. Describe the type of business you’re proposing to develop.
2. What is the proposed square footage of the development?
3. Provide a sketch, to scale, of the proposed development in relationship to the lot. (Attachment C)
4. What is the benefit of the proposed development to the community?
5. What is the value of the proposed improvements (in dollars)?
6. What is your proposed timeline for development?

Included for your convenience:

Attachment A: Criteria used when evaluating each submitted proposal.
Attachment B: A location map showing the subject property.
Attachment C: The property parcel with measurements.
Attachment D: Cordova Municipal Code - Waterfront Industrial District

Please mail proposals to: City of Cordova
Planning Department
C/O Proposals
P.O. Box 1210
Cordova, Alaska 99574

Or email proposals to planning2@cityofcordova.net. The email subject line shall be “Proposal for Lot 2, Block 7,” and the proposal shall be attached to the email as a PDF file.

Or deliver your proposal to the front desk at City Hall.

For questions or more information about the land disposal process, contact the City Planning Department at 424-6220, planning2@cityofcordova.net, or stop by in person.

Proposals received after December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM will not be considered.
Each proposal will be evaluated on the criteria in the table below. Each criteria will be scored from 1-10. The multiplier will then be applied to the scores to determine a final score.

**Final Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area: 11,534 SF
Chapter 18.33 - WATERFRONT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

Sections:

18.33.010 - Purpose.

The following statement of intent and use regulations shall apply in the WI district:

The waterfront Industrial district is intended to be applied to land with direct access or close proximity to navigable tidal waters within the city. Uses within the waterfront industrial district are intended to be marine-dependent or marine-oriented, and primarily those uses which are particularly related to location or commercial enterprises that derive an economic benefit from a waterfront location.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.020 - Permitted principal uses and structures.

The following are the permitted principal uses and structures in the waterfront industrial district:

A. Marine sales;
B. Open wet moorage;
C. Covered wet moorage;
D. Passenger staging facility;
E. Haulout facilities;
F. Marine construction, repair and dismantling;
G. Cargo terminal;
H. Cargo handling and marine-oriented staging area;
I. Fish and seafood processing;
J. Warehousing and wholesaling;
K. Open storage for marine-related facilities;
L. Fuel storage and sales.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.030 - Permitted accessory uses and structures.

A. Bunkhouses in conjunction with permitted principal uses;
B. Residential dwelling for watchman or caretaker employed on the premises, or owner-operator and members of his family, in conjunction with permitted principal uses;
C. Retail business when accessory to a permitted principal use.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.040 - Conditional uses and structures.

Subject to the requirements of the conditional use standards and procedures of this title, the following uses and structures may be permitted in the WI district:

A. Log storage and rafting;
B. Timber and mining manufacturing.
18.33.050 - Prohibited uses and structures.

Any use or structure not of a character as indicated under permitted uses, accessory uses, or conditional uses.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.060 - Setbacks.

A. Minimum Setbacks.
   1. Front yard-Twenty feet.
   2. Side yard and rear yard: subject to Uniform Building Code regarding fire walls and separation of buildings.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.070 - Lot coverage.

A. Maximum lot coverage by all buildings and structures as regulated by the Uniform Building Code.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.080 - Height.

A. Maximum height of buildings and structures: subject to Uniform Building Code regarding building heights.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.090 - Off-street parking and loading.

A. Off-street Parking and Loading. The requirements for off-street parking and loading in the waterfront industrial district shall be as set forth in Chapter 18.48 of this code.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.100 - Minimum lot requirements.

A. Minimum Lot Requirements.
   1. Lot width: 100 feet;
   2. Lot size: 10,000 feet.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.110 - Signs.

A. Signs. Signs may be allowed in the waterfront industrial district subject to the supplementary district regulations, the Uniform Sign Code, as set forth in Chapter 18.44 of this code.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.120 - Floor elevations.

A. Minimum Finished Floor Elevations. In the waterfront industrial district, the following minimum finished floor elevations for the ground floor shall be adhered to:

   North Fill Development Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27.00'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>26.50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>26.50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>26.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>26.50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>26.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>27.25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 7</td>
<td>26.25’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 8</td>
<td>26.75’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The elevation datum used is based on the following described bench mark:

USC & GS Standard Brass Disk Located in Sidewalk Adjacent to Fish Game Building near Southwest Corner of Intersection Railroad Avenue and Breakwater Avenue. Elevation 40.40 Above M.L.L.W.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).

18.33.130 - Site plan review.

A. Prior to the issuance of a building for construction within the waterfront industrial district, the planning commission shall approve the development plan for the project. The site plan review shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of this code.

B. The exterior siding and roof shall be finished in earhtone colors.

(Ord. 634 (part), 1988).
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: Richard and Osa Schultz

Name of Organization: dba: Mobile Grid Trailers, Inc.

Address: PO Box 1291 - 109 Council Ave. - Cordova, AK 99574

Phone #: 907-253-5269 Osa’s cell, 907-253-3146 Ric’s cell

Email: AdoreAlaska@gmail.com

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park is $65,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $67,500

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 9, 2014
MOBILE GRID TRAILERS, INC.  Owners/Operators: Richard and Osa Schultz
PO Box 1291
Cordova, AK  99574

Mobile Grid Trailers began doing business in 1985 providing boat trailering services and building trailers for the Cordova fishing fleet. Within a few years we began providing repair and towing services to the general Cordova public as well. In 1989 we moved into a unit at Bayside Storage. In April of 2000, we rented Lot 2 of Block 7 from the City of Cordova for staging our trailers and equipment. It has always been our intent to purchase this property, however, it has only recently become practical for us to transition our operations into a structure on the property.

Our current operations include:

- Trailering Boats for Repairs by owner or to local shops
- Boat Blocking for Seasonal Layup or Hull Repairs
- Boat and Utility Trailer Manufacturing, Sales and Repairs
- Wheel Bearing Repair and Trailer tire Mounting
- Retail Sales of Trailer Axles, Tires, Rims and Suspension Parts
- Loading/Offloading vehicles, equipment and boats on/off ferry
- Automotive Recovery and Towing
- Automotive Disposal preparation
- Equipment Rental – Trailers, Scaffolding, Blocking
- Equipment Moving – nets, engines, etc.
- Light Salvage – Repurposing of usable metal, trailer and auto parts
- Equipment Storage
Current Business Activity and Revenues

Our active Customer List totals 344 - being clients we have provided services for or sold products to in the last 4 years. Some customers we helped once, others multiple times. Invoices for boat tows usually include a Pull & Launch and often sales invoices include a combination of services - boat tows as well as trailer repairs & parts.

This chart shows a relative breakdown of our different activities tabulated from those invoices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Boat/Trailer Tows</th>
<th>Truck or Car Tows</th>
<th>Repairs</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our current operations have generated these revenues and the resulting Sales Taxes over the last 4 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>PARTS</th>
<th>TRAILERS</th>
<th>TOTAL SALES</th>
<th>SALES TAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45,240</td>
<td>3,925</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$49,265</td>
<td>$2,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38,591</td>
<td>9,909</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
<td>$2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39,665</td>
<td>6,471</td>
<td>5,825</td>
<td>$51,961</td>
<td>$2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53,850</td>
<td>7,931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$61,781</td>
<td>$2,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the 14 years that we have leased this city lot it has been essential for the operation of our business. It provides space for staging and storage of our trailer fleet and equipment. We reduced the size of our trailer fleet over the last 6 years as more fishermen purchased their own trailers. We rented this extra space, approximately 1/3 of the total area, to our customers for storage of their boats, trailers, and equipment. This fall we turned away those customers in preparation for this project.
As the Cordova fleet has increased their ownership of boat trailers, the South Fill has become less available for parking and repairs. In response the City has made useful improvements to the trailer staging area on the North Fill. We have increasingly used the North Ramp since the addition of the floating dock, and even more this last season with water & electricity available in that area. With our current shop location at Bayside Storage and our equipment staged on the adjacent lot, Mobile Grid has been perfectly located to provide services at both ramps. This proximity has allowed us to support the City’s intent to increase usage of the North Ramp.

Presently, we are the only commercial marine service business located on the North Fill.

**Proposed Building – Size, Use, and Value**
Our plan is to construct a warehouse 62’ x 70’ with a square footage of 4,340. It would be divided into 2 large bays and a group of rental lockers – 4 @ 300 sq. ft. and 2 @ 180 sq. ft. Mobile Grid will utilize about 1600 sq. ft. of the warehouse leaving 2740 sq. ft. of its 1st floor available for lease. The rental income at $1 per sq. ft. would average $2,700/ month and generate an additional $1973 per year in sales tax.

We are also looking to have it engineered to eventually add a second floor loft that could be made available for net storage and gear hanging. As commercial fishers for over 30 years, we know that there is great demand for indoor space for these uses.

We have been communicating with R & M Steel Co. to review warehouse package options. There are a reputable company that has provided engineered building packages for construction in Cordova for decades; they are very familiar with the snow and wind requirements of our area.
We estimate the improvements to the property for this development to be valued at approximately $275,000. The substantial increase in the property taxes on the lot would generate additional revenues for the city.

**Proposed Timeline**
We have already begun to reduce the amount of superfluous equipment and materials on the lot; multiple vehicles and a boat damaged by the 2012 snow fall, and items previously being kept for salvage or recycle opportunities, have been consolidated or disposed of. We will continue this process throughout the winter as weather allows.

**Spring 2015**
We presently have financing available and are prepared to purchase the property in the amount of $67,500, plus the required fees as per city code, within 90 days of the City presenting us a sale contract.
Once we are the titled property owners, we will commence the development process, applying for the required permits and preparing the lot for the laying out of a structure. The lot requires a substantial amount of fill to bring it up to a buildable grade, and it will require reasonable amount of time to be worked and settled.
**Summer 2015**
Once our building plans have been approved, installation of utilities and site preparation will follow as crews are available and weather permits. While we will be commercial fishing as well as continuing to operate our other businesses at this time, we will make every effort to move the project forward and keep the property in a productive mode.

Ideally, we would like to start construction by the end of the summer, however, with many unknowns and multiple factors influencing the schedule, it is possible that phase will not happen until Spring of 2016.

**Benefits to the Community**
Presently, our company provides important services to the marine industry as well as to the general public by offering towing of boats, trucks, cars, and equipment. Cordova’s rugged environment takes its toll on axles and tires, keeping them in repair is critical for their safe operation. We deal with many failed trailers during the season and get them back to work for their owners.
This location also makes it easy for us to support the Harbor Dept. in encouraging boat owners to use the North Ramp facility, reducing the trailer traffic around the City Harbor ramp. The approval of this project will allow our business to grow and offer more products to our customers. Once our company sets up business in the new warehouse we expect to be able to hire an additional employee to increase our hours of operation, our shop productivity, and retail sales.

The North Fill was originally created for precisely this type of development. Lot 2 of Block 7 is an essential component to the future of our business. There is virtually no alternative property in the area to relocate to – losing it would force us to liquidate the majority of our equipment and assets. This would gravely reduce the services we can provide to our customers, undermine our ability to meet our overhead costs, and could ultimately result in the closure of our business.

We respectfully request your careful consideration of our proposal. Please advise us of all scheduled meeting dates that we could be available to comment on our behalf and we invite you to contact us with any questions regarding this proposal.

Thank you,

Richard & Osa Schultz
Mobile Grid Trailers, Inc.
**Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria**

**Proposal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park. See attached map.

Name of Proposer:  

Name of Organization: Trident Seafoods Corp.

Address: 5303 Shilshole Ave NW  

Seattle WA 98107

Phone #: 206.783.3818

Email: risaacson@tridentseafoods.com

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park is $65,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $ 90,000

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney's fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees, as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
December 1, 2014

RE: Property: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park.

To City of Cordova Planning Department,

Trident Seafoods is proposing to develop Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park into a 3 story, 144 person bunkhouse that will be approximately 15,000 square feet. The design will be similar to the bunkhouse that we built in 2013. With the increase in bunk space we will be able to increase our daily production by 25% and give us the ability bring more fish and taxes into the City of Cordova. We are budgeting $2,000,000 for this project, not including the price of purchase for the property. We are looking at a completion in the spring of 2016.

Please see attached drawing of proposed building.

Please contact me if you have any further questions.

Thank you,

Rick Isaacs
Trident Seafoods Corporation
PWS Operations Manager
Direct: 206-297-5663
Email: risaacsen@tridentseafoods.com
8 rooms @ 6 people = 48 people per floor

3 floors @ 48 = Total 144 burks.
**Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria**

Proposal: ________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by **December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.**

Property: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: Moe Zamarron

Name of Organization: Native Village of Eyak

Address: PO Box 1388
Cordova, AK 99574

Phone #: 907-424-7738
Email: moe.zamarron@eyak-nsn.gov

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

**The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.**

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park is **$65,000.00.** The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the **minimum** price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

**Proposed Price $ 65,000**

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney’s fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the **Waterfront Industrial District.**
Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park, City of Cordova, Alaska.

Current location of Mobile Grid

1. The Native Village of Eyak (NVE) proposes to develop the above referenced parcel into a combination marine and land based transportation service facility providing an assortment of general repair, maintenance and upgrade tasks. To address the growing needs of its expanding fleet of vessels and work vehicles it is necessary for NVE to make plans for a new facility that would adequately support in-house operations. While some amenities would be limited in use to NVE while others would be made available commercially. Equipment has been secured that enables NVE to perform shrink-wrapping of vessels and equipment, perform tire repair for large trucks and heavy equipment and to provide general welding work. These services would be available to the public from this facility along with the rental of specialized equipment, with certain restrictions. Additionally, room would be made available for the storage of small vessels, equipment and supplies but only for NVE programs.

2. Taking final design criteria and code restrictions into account NVE proposes to set the area of the building at the maximum allowed for the lot. Once the design team has considered all pertinent information a final footprint can be presented but initially this proposal shows a 60’ x 115’ building for an area of 6,900 square feet. Drainage, parking space counts, snow handling and setbacks all will have bearing on the building layout and may alter the proposed square footage of development.

3. See attachment ‘A’ for required sketch of proposed development.

4. Benefit of proposed development to the community. NVE operates a number of programs that bring direct benefit to the tribal members in the area and to the community of Cordova at large. Through the transportation, natural resources, wellness and housing departments NVE channels outside funding to Cordova that promotes health, affordable utilities and increased standards of living. The ability of NVE to house, maintain and operate equipment related to these programs offers two primary benefits for continued program development. First, this facility provides the means to keep program equipment functional, efficient and ready for use. This demonstrates to funders a level of competence and responsibility on the part of NVE in following through with the requirements of program expansion. Secondly, the new facility provides potential funders with an accurate picture of NVE’s ability to build capacity through preparation and partnership development. This facility will provide services that are not currently in Cordova which reinforces local economic wellbeing and promotes cooperation between organizations. Future programs will receive more favorable consideration when local interests are addressed collectively.

5. The dollar value of the proposed development is estimated at $759,000.

6. The proposed timeline for development is to have an initial design ready by the 1st quarter of 2016 and have construction start in 2017.
## Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria

**Proposal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEALED PROPOSAL FORM

All proposals must be received by the Planning Department by December 1st, 2014 at 10 AM.

Property: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park. See attached map.

Name of Proposer: KATRINA HOFFMAN

Name of Organization: PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND SCIENCE CENTER

Address: 300 BREAKWATER AVENUE
          PO BOX 705
          CORDOVA, AK 99574

Phone #: 907.424.5800 x 225
Email: khoffman@pwssc.org

Note: All submitted proposals for this property will be reviewed by the Planning Commission using the attached criteria. The Planning Commission will then recommend a proposal to City Council for final review and acceptance.

The City Council reserves the right to reject any proposal, part of any proposal, or all proposals. The City Council may accept any proposal deemed most advantageous to the City of Cordova.

The chosen proposal will be subject to a Site Plan Review conducted in accordance with Chapter 18.42 of the Cordova Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the City Council must approve the site plan for the project and the State Fire Marshal must approve the plan review for Fire and Life Safety.

The fair market value for Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park is $65,000.00. The fair market value has been determined by a qualified licensed appraiser and will be the minimum price that will be accepted for the property. If the successful proposal amount is greater than the minimum price, that shall be the amount paid for the property.

All organizations that submit proposals will be required to meet the appropriate criteria within Cordova Municipal Code Section 5.22. A link to the City Code is available at www.cityofcordova.net.

Proposed Price $100,000.00

The applicant shall also be responsible for all fees and costs the City incurred to third-parties in the transaction, including without limitation costs of appraisal, attorney's fees and costs, surveying and platting fees and costs, closing costs and escrow fees as per City of Cordova Municipal Code section 5.22.100.

Please review the attached section of Code for the permitted uses within the Waterfront Industrial District.
Property: Lot 2, Block 7, North Fill Development Park

Name of Proposer: Katrina Hoffman
Name of Organization: Prince William Sound Science Center
Address: 300 Breakwater Avenue, PO Box 705, Cordova, AK 99574
Phone: 907-424-5800 x225
Email: khoffman@pwssc.org

Additional Information Required:

1. Describe the type of business you're proposing to develop.

This site will be developed as a portion of the distributed campus of a well-known research and education institution, the Prince William Sound Science Center. The building developed on this site will provide:
-- shop space for marine equipment construction, repair, and dismantling;
-- warehousing for equipment and supply storage;
-- marine oriented staging for research activities
-- haulout and storage area for the multiple vessels owned by the organization, as dictated by vessel maintenance and storage needs
-- bunkhouse space for employees and professionals with responsibility for using, constructing, repairing, dismantling, and/or organizing supplies and equipment of the business
-- Yard space and lean-to space will allow for the storage and maintenance of rolling stock, vessels, and deployable equipment.

2. What is the proposed square footage of the development?

The proposed square footage of the development is 2,400 square feet per floor at two stories for a total of 4,800 square feet in an enclosed building. The site development plan also includes a lean-to structure that will provide covered storage outside the building. The lean-to has a 600 square foot footprint. There is additional space allocated in the site plan for haulout and storage of the vessels owned by PWSSC, as dictated by vessel maintenance needs.

The maximum height shall not exceed that dictated by Uniform Building Code.

Off-street parking and loading is provided for as designated in the site plan.

3. Provide a sketch, to scale, of the proposed development in relationship to the lot.

See Attachment C.
4. What is the benefit of the proposed development to the community?

The benefits of the proposed development to the community are multiple. It will support an organization that has between 20 (year round) to 30 (high season) employees on staff at any given time of year. It will allow for the addition of an employee at an operations manager level. Construction of the facility will employ local laborers and use materials from local vendors, generating sales tax revenue through direct purchases. Seasonal employees who stay in the bunk space will be within walking distance of the downtown core and will purchase goods and services in the community, generating sales taxes as well. Increased access to space for constructing, maintaining, and storing research equipment will attract research collaborations with individuals from organizations outside of Cordova. These collaborations will generate additional visitors to the community.

The importance to the community is high. These facilities are critical to the ability of PWSSC to carry out its water dependent and water related work, with an annual budget of $5,000,000 and over $100,000 per month in local payroll. Further, these facilities will enable PWSSC to increase the value of the annual work pursued and completed, enabling the hiring of one or more additional permanent staff and drawing multiple visitors from collaborating institutions to Cordova for shorter periods of time.

The building will be designed to represent the aesthetic of a classic fishing village cannery building. External trim will give it charm. A functional yet decorative balcony off the second floor will be constructed of handsome decking materials and will enable the display of planters that permit seasonal landscaping enhancements.

The center-peak roof of the building will allow snow to shed to both sides of the building. There is ample space purposefully left available for the movement and storage of snow onsite.

5. What is the value of the proposed improvements (in dollars)?

The value of the proposed improvements is $350,000.

6. What is your proposed timeline for development?

The proposed timeline for building completion is 12 months. Within 18 months, at least one new permanent staff member will be hired. Within 24 months, relationships will be established with partners that will draw collaborators to Cordova for research and education purposes.
Area: 11,534 SF

- 40' x 60' metal building
- 40' x 15' lean-to covered storage
- Vessel storage area (uncovered)

Parking areas with setbacks indicated.
## Land Disposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposal: _______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Proposal Rank 1-10</th>
<th>Subtotal for Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of improvements</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Community</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yr Business Plan/Timeline</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 12/4/14
Re: Second Street Parking Recommendation to City Council

PART I – GENERAL INFORMATION

This memo was presented to the Planning Commission at the October 28th Regular Meeting in the Planner’s Report. At the request of the commission, it has been edited to become an action item as a recommendation from the commission to City Council.

At the Planning Commission September 24th Work Session, staff was directed to investigate the parking on Second Street between Browning Avenue and Council Avenue. Staff have determined that the total length of curb dedicated to parking is approximately 320 feet (see Attachment A). Using the measurements provided in the City’s Code (18.48.010 see Part II), there would be the following number of parking spaces for each condition:

- Parallel Parking (0°) – 13 spaces
- Angled Parking (35°) – 17 spaces
- Angled Parking (45°) – 21 spaces
- Angled Parking (55°) – 26 spaces

The parking currently on Second Street appears to be generally 45°-55° from the curb, however the parking spaces are not delineated in the entire length of the street. The parallel parking scenario accounts for 23 feet, but this is probably more variable as there are no lines painted on the ground (ex.: Main Street is parallel parking, but individual spaces are not marked so as to provide the maximum number of parking spaces) and the length of larger vehicles reaches nearly 23 feet. The amount of spaces decreases fairly significantly as you change the angle of the parking.

In conclusion, a good rule of thumb is that angled parking at 55° provides two times the amount of parking spaces as parallel parking, however whether or not the spaces are marked on the ground likely plays a large role in the actual number of spaces used.

PART II – APPLICABLE CODE

A. The traffic authority of the city is empowered to make regulations necessary to make effective the provisions of the traffic ordinances of this city and to make and enforce temporary or experimental regulations to cover emergencies or special conditions. No such temporary or experimental regulation shall remain in effect for more than ninety days.

In this title:
B. "Traffic authority" means the city manager or the city manager's designee.
Chapter 18.48.010 ZONING – OFF-STREET PARKING, LOADING AND UNLOADING – General regulations.

F. Plans for the layout of off-street parking facilities shall be in accordance with the following minimum requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Pattern</th>
<th>Maneuvering Lane Width</th>
<th>Parking Space Width</th>
<th>Parking Space Length</th>
<th>Total Width of One Tier of Spaces Plus Maneuvering Lane</th>
<th>Total Width of Two Tiers of Spaces Plus Maneuvering Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0° (parallel parking)</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>23 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>28 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30° to 53°</td>
<td>13 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>33 ft.</td>
<td>53 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54° to 74°</td>
<td>18 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft.</td>
<td>21 ft.</td>
<td>39 ft.</td>
<td>60 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75° to 90°</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft.</td>
<td>19 ft.</td>
<td>44 ft.</td>
<td>63 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART III – STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Following the last Regular Meeting, City staff met to go over different options for parking on Second Street. Staff attending the meeting included police chief, fire chief and public works. Many options were reviewed including P&Z’s recommendation of moving towards all parallel parking for the entire West side of the street. Staff believes that the challenge at the intersection can be mitigated by less impactful measures. Staff would recommend the Planning Commission to consider recommending to City Council that the parking on the West side of Second Street be changed as follows:

- The first 50 feet of angled parking going South from Council Avenue will be parking for compact cars only (<17 ft), and will be delineated by paint on the asphalt and signage.

Staff decided on this recommendation because it does not decrease the number of parking spaces on Second Street, but will eliminate the issue of longer vehicles extending out into the intersection. It also has the least amount of impact on the business located on the corner. The first 15 feet of the curb will be “No Parking” and the next 50 feet will be compact only (17 feet or less) and have angled lines painted that will control the angle at which the vehicle is parked. Public safety has tried different lengths of cars and believes that a 17 foot cut off will be adequate when parked at the correct angle to allow traffic to turn into the lane without having to veer into the oncoming lane. This length includes small cars, trucks and SUVs but would not include full size, extended cab, or long beds trucks.

- Average car: 14’
- Small pickup truck: 18’
- Full pickup truck, SUV, or van: 20’ or 22’

PART IV – RECOMMENDED MOTION

“I move the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that the parking on the West side of Second Street be changed as follows (select one option below or suggest other):

- The first 50 feet of angled parking going South from Council Avenue will be parking for compact cars only (<17 ft), and will be delineated by paint on the asphalt and signage.

- The West side of Second Street will be parallel parking from Council to Browning Avenue.
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 12/4/14
Re: Snow Load Discussion

PART I – GENERAL INFORMATION

The commission requested a discussion on the 150 lbs. per square foot ground snow load requirement. Staff prepared this memo to help provide background information and facilitate the discussion.

GROUND SNOW LOAD – The weight of snow on the ground. The 50-year mean recurrence of ground snow is used to determine the design roof snow load.

ROOF SNOW LOAD – Load induced by the weight of snow on the roof of the structure.

Links for additional information:

http://www.bgstructuralengineering.com/BGASCE7/BGASCE7008/index.htm

http://www.ce.udel.edu/courses/CIEG407/CIEG_407_Protected/Chapter%207%20Commentary.pdf

http://www.civil.utah.edu/~cv5450/roofload/SNOWLOAD.htm
good general information

how snow load is calculated

The Truss Company provided a quote showing the cost difference in trusses for 100 lbs. and 150 lbs. snow load. (Attachment F) This is for 40 X 60 shop, seismic D, wind load 100 and Condition C. I have contacted an engineer from Anchorage to provide a cost comparison of the engineering requirements between the snow loads. At the time the packet is being printed we have not received a report. If the report comes prior to the meeting we will email it to the commissioners and provide copies at the P&Z meeting.

Attachments: Attachment A: Excerpt from Minutes of 4/10/12 Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Attachment B: Excerpt from Minutes of 5/8/12 Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Attachment C: Resolution 12-03
Attachment D: Excerpt from Minutes of 5/14/12 City Council Special Meeting
Attachment E: Ground Snow Load Analysis prepared by Steve “Hoots” Witsoe
Attachment F: Cost Comparison for Trusses

PART II – BACKGROUND

4/10/12 – At the Planning Commission Regular Meeting, the commission had a discussion on the snow load requirements for Cordova. See attached minutes.
5/8/12 – At the Planning Commission Regular Meeting, the commission had Steve “Hoots” Witsoe prepare a report and give a recommendation concerning snow load. The commission went on to pass Resolution 12-03 recommending the change in snow load to City Council. See attached minutes and resolution.

5/14/12 – At the City Council Special Meeting, the council accepted the resolution from the Planning Commission. See attached minutes for the discussion.

6/20/12 – At the City Council Regular Meeting, the council passed the first reading of Ordinance 1095, an ordinance increasing the ground snow load to 150 lbs. per square foot. The ordinance was passed in the consent calendar with no discussion.

7/5/12 – At the City Council Regular Meeting, the council passed the second reading of the ordinance with no discussion.

PART III – APPLICABLE CODE

16.15.2305(d) LOCAL AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIFORM BUILDING CODE, 1985 EDITION – Snow Loads.

Delete the last sentence in the second paragraph and substitute the following:

(i) The minimum basic design snow load shall be 100 pounds per square foot on the horizontal projection of the roof for building permits issued or required prior to September 1, 2012.

(ii) The minimum basic design snow load shall be 150 pounds per square foot ground snow load for construction requiring or issued a building permit on or after September 1, 2012.
2.) Discussion on Snow Load

Reggiani ~ Well I asked that maybe we take a look at this after the recent event that we just went through, it seemed like in the community here was a lot of confusion on snow load and what it Code and why are buildings collapsing. I kind of looked into it and I looked at the table of Ground Snow Loads for Alaska communities. What stood out to me was that Cordova was at 100 psf, Yakutat is at 150 psf, Valdez is at 160 psf and Whittier is at 300 psf. I couldn't really figure out where that data actually come from and how old that table is. And I don’t know if that matters or not but typically with historical datasets you’ll update them periodically and I don’t know what our ground load was this year compared to the historical average.

Josh Hallquist ~ That’s what you’re supposed to base it off of is a 50 year snow.

Reggiani ~ It looks like the Alaska Statues leave it up to the local municipality. Other than just picking a number I don’t really know how to put some data behind it.

Pegau ~ We actually are collecting the data up on Ski Hill, there’s a snow pillow that gives you snow water equivalents. It will tell you exactly how much water equivalent there was and from that you can figure out the pounds per square foot. Historically there hasn’t been a measure other than height, but for the last five years they’ve been recording the snow depth at that elevation.

Reggiani ~ When do you think that data will be available?

Pegau ~ It’s online, I always end up looking up Mt. Eyak SNOTEL.

Greenwood ~ Hoots and Kirsti are checking it regularly.

Srb ~ Tom, I have a question I’d just like to hang out there. With regards particularly to the Municipal buildings and such but is there a mechanism or way of developing a mechanism that kind of takes away the decision making process out of any one individuals processes with regards to making a determination that I need to have this shoveled or that shoveled. Some kind of way of calculating a real time snow load within the municipality that says; “within these parameters all municipal buildings will hire somebody to shovel the roofs.”

Bailer ~ I think Dave (Reggiani) is kind of heading that direction aren’t you?

Reggiani ~ We are, Council has asked me to start working on a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the School District to talk about maintenance of all of the municipal buildings so that one party isn’t waiting for another party or thinking that the other party is going to do something and the same thing the other way. But as far as actually getting some data and understanding that I think you could probably come up with some real good general rules from that. But going through all of this, I was impressed, just to get the discussion started I was just hoping for the table to be thrown into this but Faith and Sam did a wonderful job putting everything in there. I was looking and happy to find an importance factor thrown into it on page 64 and I think what we need to have from the City’s side of things is some history and make sure that the importance factor was factored into the equation on these municipal buildings for sure. The higher the category the more important the facility is to the community.

Josh Hallquist ~ I would say by what I’ve seen here it would be safe to bump it up a little bit.

Srb ~ On our current building permits if someone comes in and says that they want to attach a shed style roof to the side of their house, is there any requirement for engineering?

Samantha Greenwood ~ We don’t require engineering for in residential for anything.

After a lengthy discussion the Commission agreed to have the data from the SNOTEL site compiled and bring that information back for further dialogue.
Attachment B: Excerpt from Minutes of 5/8/12 Regular Meeting

1. Snow Load

Steve “Hoots” Witsoe ~ Okay, Snow Loads area what’s used to determine how much load they can hold and what the roof needs to be built for. The Code book has a table and Cordova is at 100 pounds per square foot, the interesting thing about that is Yakutat is at 150 psf, Valdez is at 160 psf and Whittier is at 300 pounds per square foot. So the purpose of what I was doing was use extreme value statistical analysis to determine what our snow load really is. So, what I did is I went through weather data and we don’t have great weather data, but we do have 26 years from CEC’s Orca Power Plant and then we have a bunch of data from the Airport. Originally I had more information from the Power Plant and the Power Plant typically represents the town better than the Airport. Keep in mind that we get much more snow at higher elevations than we do at sea level.

I came up with two recommendations:

140 pounds per square foot at Sea level and at 100 vertical feet you would add another 20 pounds. (40% density)
150 pounds per square foot at Sea level and at 100 vertical feet you would add another 20 pounds. (50% density)

Commission had a lengthy discussion and explanations on the snow load data provided by Hoots.

Bailer ~ Thank you so much for all your hard work on this.

Bailer ~ Tom how about you, you’re doing a lot of building, what do you think?

McGann ~ I think we should increase it, I was looking at it from a cost standpoint in residential. A cut roof, basically just adding more rafters, even if you had to double the amount of rafter it would only increase the dry in package by 3.6%. I looked at trusses and if you had to double the trusses it would only increase the total dry in package by 4.6%. So I don’t think that it’s becoming cost prohibitive to do this stuff.

Bailer ~ Yeah I would agree.

Samantha Greenwood ~ And I talked with a metal guy I don’t know if you saw it in the Planners Report, but he is in Wasilla but has built buildings here. He did say that he thought that the labor would not substantially increase, but that there would be an increase of about 25%. Most of that would be weight and shipping.

Srb ~ With the idea in mind that some of these properties are being sold as seasonal and nobody is going to be there to babysit them it might behoove us to bump things up and try to better protect investments.

Samantha Greenwood ~ Okay, so I threw in that resolution in case you guys wanted to move forward like that, it’s not something that we have to do.

After a lengthy discussion and explanation on the snow load data provided by Hoots the Commission agreed that in their opinion the snow load for Cordova should be increased to 150 pounds per square foot.

M/Srb S/McGann “I’d like to make a motion to make a change in the current snow load requirement of 100 pounds ground snow load to 150 pounds ground snow load to the City Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska.

Bailer ~ Scott did you hear the motion?

Pegau ~ Yes, I did hear the motion, the only comment I had was on the “whereas’s” you might want to strike “Whereas, this year’s snow load was not a record for City of Cordova.” because you can’t demonstrate it.

Samantha Greenwood ~ You’re right.

Upon voice vote, motion passed, 6-0
Attachment C: Resolution 12-03

CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION 12-03.

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA, RECOMMENDING TO CHANGE THE CURRENT SNOW LOAD REQUIREMENT OF 100 POUNDS GROUND SNOW LOAD TO 150 GROUND SNOW LOAD TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA

WHEREAS, the City of Cordova experienced an exceptional snow year for 2011-12; and

WHEREAS, there were roof collapses and damage to buildings from snow load throughout the town; and

WHEREAS, to help provide for the public welfare and safety of citizens of Cordova; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing previous years ground snow load numbers, reviewing ground snow codes for nearby coastal communities, historical snow accumulation totals, and impact building cost building; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission would like to recommend to the City Council of Cordova to accept and support the new ground snow load of 150 pounds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Cordova recommends to change the current snow load requirement of 100 pounds ground snow load to 150 ground snow load to the city council of the city of Cordova, Alaska

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 8th DAY OF MAY, 2012

[Signature]
Tom Bailer, Chairman

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Samantha Greenwood, City Planner
19. Acceptance of Planning and Zoning Commission Resolution 12-03

_M/Allison S/Reggiani_ to accept resolution 12-03 from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

_Mayor Kallander_ informed Council that to approve this resolution will add to the cost of new construction. _Beedle_ opined that if this is passed than 100% of Cordova is out of compliance. What happens when a person goes to sell their house? _Greenwood_ replied that existing structures would be grandfathered in; this would be required on new structures. _Beedle_ asked if this is passed tonight when it takes effect. Will those building currently have to adjust their plans to accommodate this change? _Greenwood_ responded that this resolution is just asking for Council's support. It is not passing anything. It will have to be changed in code, which would be an ordinance, two readings, and then 30 days after that. Until it becomes code we are still at the old code. When a person gets their building permit they will be notified of the building requirements according to code at that point in time. _Bradford_ stated that he has no problem with this he will support it. _Reggiani_ stated that he is going to support this.

Vote on motion: 4 yea, 1 nay (Beedle), 1 absent (van den Broek). Motion passes.
Ground Snow Load Analysis

Prepared for:
City of Cordova
May 1st, 2012

Prepared by:
Steve “Hoots” Witsoe
Current snow load requirements for the City of Cordova are based on the International Building Code. Design snow loads for roofs are determined using ground snow load; \( p_g \). Ground snow loads for Alaska locations are set forth in Table 7-1, ASCE 7-05, with Cordova at 100 lbs/ft\(^2\). Interestingly, Cordova’s nearest neighbors have significantly larger ground snow loads, with Yakutat at 150, Valdez at 160, and Whittier at 300 lbs/ft\(^2\). Authorities having jurisdiction can also determine ground snow load using extreme value statistical analysis of data available with a 2 percent annual probability of being exceeded (50 year mean recurrence interval).\(^1\)

Weather data for Cordova is limited to CEC Orca Power Plant\(^2\), Mudhole Smith Airport\(^3\), Mt Eyak Snotel\(^4\), and personal observations\(^5\).

For this analysis, 26 years of power plant data and 14 years of airport data was used. A larger dataset exists for the airport but was not accessible at the time. While weather can be quite different between the power plant and the airport, their annual maximum height of snow is very similar (see Figure 1). The power plant data was used over the airport data because the data set was larger and the snow heights were slightly higher. It should also be noted that there are no weather records available for Whitshed Road, where snow heights are generally accepted as higher than the rest of town.

Extensive value statistical analysis was done using Gumbel Distributions and Gringorten estimations.\(^6\) For CEC Power Plant data, the maximum height of snow =11.387x+19.381. Using a 50 year return period, \( x=-\ln(-\ln(1-(1/50))=3.90 \), and the height of snow = 63.8 in. (See figure 2)
Mt Eyak Snotel had only 7 years of data, but gives insight into the affects of elevation on snow height. Its location is at approximately 1500 feet. The Snotel site, however, is prone to wind stripping. The nearby snow stake at the top of the ski hill has a similar elevation but offers a more wind loaded site, and shows the differences of snow height with site selection (see Figure 2).

Analysis of Mt Eyak Snotel data estimated a 50 year event at 156.9 inches, while Top Station data estimated 255.3 inches. An average of the data was used for the analysis to compensate for the differences between the datasets. Analysis of the average estimated a 50 year event at 212.9 inches.
Ground snow load equals the maximum height of snow multiplied by the density of snow. Densities vary through the snow pack, so a single density is used to estimate the value. Industry standard varies from 30% to 50% density of water, with 40% the norm. With the amount of rain Cordova can receive in winter, 50% density may be realistic. However, by the time 50% density is reached the height of snow would be lower than the maximum.

Using the Power Plant data for sea level, and the average of Snotel and Top Station data for 1500 vertical feet, a linear equation was used to interpolate the ground snow load versus elevation. This was done for both 40% and 50% density (See Figure 5).

**Figure 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snow Load (lbs/ft²) vs Elevation (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph showing snow load vs elevation for 40% and 50% density" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y = 0.2587x + 166.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y = 0.207x + 132.94$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The 40% and 50% linear equations offer a recommended range for ground snow loads with respect to elevation. To simplify the equations for easier use, the slope and intercept can be rounded. The first recommended equation closely resembles the 40% equation, while the second recommended equation is slightly more conservative.

Recommended Ground Snow Load:

$$p_g (\text{lbs/ft}^2) = 140 + (0.2 \times \text{Elevation in feet})$$

$$p_g (\text{lbs/ft}^2) = 150 + (0.25 \times \text{Elevation in feet})$$
### CEC Orca Power Plant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Max HS</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \text{Pv} )</th>
<th>( \ln (\text{Pv}) )</th>
<th>( \ln (\ln (\text{Pv})) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.02144</td>
<td>3.84252</td>
<td>-1.34613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.05972</td>
<td>2.81802</td>
<td>-1.03603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.09801</td>
<td>2.32269</td>
<td>-0.84273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.13629</td>
<td>1.99294</td>
<td>-0.68961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.17458</td>
<td>1.74538</td>
<td>-0.55697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.21286</td>
<td>1.54710</td>
<td>-0.43638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.25115</td>
<td>1.38171</td>
<td>-0.32332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.28943</td>
<td>1.23983</td>
<td>-0.21497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.32772</td>
<td>1.11560</td>
<td>-0.10939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.36600</td>
<td>1.00511</td>
<td>-0.00510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.40429</td>
<td>0.90563</td>
<td>0.09913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.44257</td>
<td>0.81515</td>
<td>0.20438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.48086</td>
<td>0.73218</td>
<td>0.31172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.51914</td>
<td>0.65558</td>
<td>0.42224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.55743</td>
<td>0.58442</td>
<td>0.53713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.59571</td>
<td>0.51800</td>
<td>0.65778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.63400</td>
<td>0.45571</td>
<td>0.78590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.67228</td>
<td>0.39708</td>
<td>0.92362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.71057</td>
<td>0.34169</td>
<td>1.07384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.74885</td>
<td>0.28921</td>
<td>1.24059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.78714</td>
<td>0.23935</td>
<td>1.42981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.82542</td>
<td>0.19186</td>
<td>1.65098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.86371</td>
<td>0.14652</td>
<td>1.92057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.90199</td>
<td>0.10315</td>
<td>2.27156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.94028</td>
<td>0.06158</td>
<td>2.78738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.97856</td>
<td>0.02167</td>
<td>3.83170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Snotel & Top Station Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Snotel</th>
<th>Top Station</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \text{Pv} )</th>
<th>( \ln (\text{Pv}) )</th>
<th>( \ln (\ln (\text{Pv})) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07865</td>
<td>2.54273</td>
<td>-0.93324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.21910</td>
<td>1.51822</td>
<td>-0.41754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.35955</td>
<td>1.02290</td>
<td>-0.02264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.50000</td>
<td>0.69315</td>
<td>0.36651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.64045</td>
<td>0.44559</td>
<td>0.80837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.78090</td>
<td>0.24731</td>
<td>1.39711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>183.5</td>
<td>183.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.92135</td>
<td>0.08192</td>
<td>2.50205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRODUCT PROPOSAL AND PURCHASE AGREEMENT

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO: [Company Name]

Phone Quote/Walk-In

ATTN: Customer
STREET: CPU
CITY: CPU - Eugene
STATE: OR
FAX:  
PHONE: 

We are pleased to quote the Metal-Connected Wood Trusses for this project.

A. Roof Loading: 25.0 k.p.s.f.  
   Truss Gable Stud Spacing: 0.0 in. O.C. (Typ.)
B. Lumber is Dry  
   HFlr/DFlr: 19% Moisture Content at time of manufacture.
C. F.O.B. Jobsite plateine, in bundles, within the limits of our equipment
   *PLATE LINE DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS: Street access to site, plate can be safely reached with boom, contractor aids driver, contractor assumes responsibility should the truck get stuck or breaks concrete.
D. Shop Drawings and Truss Engineering will be provided after receipt of signed Proposal and Purchase Agreement by authorized agent.
E. Allow 10 working days for manufacturing after receipt of approved drawings.
F. Hardware included with trusses:
   #0 No Blocking
   #01 No Hangers

GRAND TOTAL: $4727.00

PURCHASER: We hereby propose to furnish labor and materials -- complete in accordance with the above specifications, for the sum of: $4727.00 with payment to be made as follows:

Terms: 1/2 down at time of order, balance due at time of delivery; or not 10th with approved credit

All material is to be as specified. All work to be completed in a workmanlike manner according to standard practices. Any alteration or deviation from the above specifications involving extra costs, will be executed only upon written orders, and will become an extra charge over and above estimate.

NOTE: This proposal contingent upon approval of credit. Backcharges are not allowed without prior written approval by The Truss Co.

This proposal may be withdrawn by us if not accepted within 5 days and delivered within 15 days.

ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL

The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work specified. Payment will be made as outlined above. I agree your liability on this order is limited to the amount paid to you and that there shall be no liability or claims made by me for incidental, consequential or delay damage claims of any kind.

In the event of any delinquency in my account, I authorize you to charge me 1 1/2% (18% annual rate) per month on any delinquent account balance, together with any attorney fees, costs and expenses incurred by The Truss Co. in collecting on any amount I owe to you.

theTRUSSCO Inc.

By: [Signature]
Title: TRUSS DESIGNER

PURCHASER:

Accepted By: ____________________ Date: ____________________

Title: ____________________
**PROJECT:** City of Cordova  
**MODEL:** 100# Snow Load  
**TAG:**  
**LOT #:** SUBDIV:  

**Tentative Delivery Date:** / /  

**DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS:**  
CUSTOMER NOTES: Samantha Greenwood  
907-424-6233  
planning@cityofcordova.net  

Roof Loading: 25.0, 8.0, 0.0, 0.7, 0.0  
Truss Gable Stud Spacing: 0.0 In. O.C. (Typ.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Truss Id</th>
<th>Span</th>
<th>Truss Type</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>LOH</th>
<th>ROH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A01GE</td>
<td>40-00-00</td>
<td>OAH 07-09-13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A02</td>
<td>40-00-00</td>
<td>OAH 07-09-13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Total Trusses  
2 Total Designs  

**MISC. ITEMS @**  
Quantity: Description:  
0  #0 No Blocking  
0  #01 No Hangers  

Terms: Pre-Pay  

My signature below indicates acceptance of all terms on the Product Proposal and Purchase Agreement. The prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work specified. Payment will be made as outlined on the Product Proposal and Purchase Agreement. In the event of any delinquency in my account, I authorize you to charge me 1 1/2% (18% annual rate) per month on any delinquent account balance.

Accepted By: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________

**GRAND TOTAL** $4727.00
PRODUCT PROPOSAL AND PURCHASE AGREEMENT

**PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO:**

**QUOTE#:** 26859A  
**DATE:** 12/01/14

**Phone Quote/Walk-In**

**ATTN:** Customer  
**STREET:** CPU - Eugene

**CITY:** CPU  
**STATE:** OR

---

We are pleased to quote the Metal-Connected Wood Trusses for this project.

A. Roof Loading: 25.0.8.0.0.0.7.0  
Truss Gable Stud Spacing: 0.0 In. O.C. (Typ.)

B. Lumber is Dry HFir/DFir 19% Moisture Content at time of manufacture.

C. F.O.B. Jobsite plate line*, in bundles, within the limits of our equipment.

*PLATE LINE DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS: Street access to site, plate can be safely reached with boom, contractor aids driver, contractor assumes responsibility should the truck get stuck or breaks concrete.

D. Shop Drawings and Truss Engineering will be provided after receipt of signed Proposal and Purchase Agreement by authorized agent.

E. Allow 10 working days for manufacturing after receipt of approved drawings.

F. Hardware included with trusses:

- #0 No Blocking
- #01 No Hangers

---

**GRAND TOTAL:** $6776.00

---

**PURCHASER:**

We hereby propose to furnish labor and materials -- complete in accordance with the above specifications, for the sum of: $6776.00

with payment to be made as follows:

Terms: 1/2 down at time of order, balance due at time of delivery; or net 10th with approved credit.

All material is to be as specified. All work to be completed in a workmanlike manner according to standard practices. Any alteration or deviation from the above specifications involving extra costs, will be executed only upon written orders, and will become an extra charge over and above estimate.

**NOTE:** This proposal contingent upon approval of credit. Backcharges are not allowed without prior written approval by The Truss Co.

This proposal may be withdrawn by us if not accepted within 5 days and delivered within 15 days.

---

**ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL**

The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work specified.

Payment will be made as outlined above. I agree your liability on this order is limited to the amount paid to you and that there shall be no liability or claims made by me for incidental, consequential or delay damage claims of any kind.

In the event of any delinquency in my account, I authorize you to charge me 1 1/2% (18% annual rate) per month on any delinquent account balance, together with any attorney fees, costs and expenses incurred by The Truss Co. in collecting on any amount I owe to you.

---

**theTRUSSco Inc.**

By: [Signature]  
**Title:** TRUSS DESIGNER

**PURCHASER:**

Accepted By: __________________ Date: __________________

Title: ____________________________
### QUOTATION

**QUOTE #** 26859A  
**ORDER #**  
**PAGE** 1  
**DATE** 12/6/14

**PROJECT:** City of Cordova  
**MODEL:** 150# Snow Load  
**TAG:**  
**LOT #**  
**SUBDIV:**

**Contact:** Job Super:  
**Name:** Customer  
**Phone:** ( ) -  
**Fax:** ( ) -  
**Ordered By:**  
**Account No:** 3100  
**Salesman:** House  
**Designer:** JT  
**P.O. Number:**

**DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS:**

**CUSTOMER NOTES:** Samantha Greenwood  
967-424-6233  
planning@cityofcordova.net

**Roof Loading:** 25.0, 8.0, 0.0, 0.7.0  
**Truss Gable Stud Spacing:** 0.0 In. O.C. (Typ.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Truss Id</th>
<th>Span</th>
<th>Truss Type</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>LOH</th>
<th>ROH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A01GE</td>
<td>40-00-00</td>
<td>OAH 07-11-10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>307 lbs.</td>
<td>2 X 8 X 2 X 6</td>
<td>GABLE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A02</td>
<td>40-00-00</td>
<td>OAH 07-11-10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
<td>02-00-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>266 lbs.</td>
<td>2 X 8 X 2 X 6</td>
<td>DBL FINK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**31 Total Trusses**  
**2 Total Designs**

**MISC. ITEMS @**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>#0 No Blocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>#01 No Hangers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Terms:** Pre-Pay

My signature below indicates acceptance of all terms on the Product Proposal and Purchase Agreement. The prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work specified. Payment will be made as outlined on the Product Proposal and Purchase Agreement. In the event of any delinquency in my account, I authorize you to charge me 1 ½% (18% annual rate) per month on any delinquent account balance.

**Accepted By:**  
**Date:**

**GRAND TOTAL** $6776.00
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Staff
Date: 12/4/14
Re: Chapter 16 Building Codes

PART I – GENERAL INFORMATION

Attachment A Design Criteria
Attachment B Seismic zone map
Attachment C letter from Engineer
Attachment D comparison of 2006 to 2009 IRC
IBC is the international building code for commercial building.

IRC is the international residential code for single, two and multiply family dwellings up to 3-plexes

We are a deferred community meaning that we use the state fire marshal for fire life and safety reviews and are obligated to adopt the same IBC as the State.

For this meeting I am attaching the current design criteria for review. We will be discussing the snow load at this meeting under a different agenda item. In the past there was substantial discussion about the seismic design category for Cordova. I have attached the seismic zone map from the IRC and a letter from Grand Engineer outlining their thoughts on the seismic design category for Cordova. The city of Anchorage is Seismic Design Category – D (IBC), D₂ (IRC)

I have also attached a document that outlines the major changes between the 2009 and 2006 IRC for review. Since the State does not adopt a version of the IRC we can stay with 2006 or move to 2009.
## DESIGN CRITERIA**

In accordance with the International Building Code (IBC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Type</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof Snow Load</td>
<td>150 lbs. per sq. foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Speed</td>
<td>100 mile per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Zone</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weathering</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost Line Depth</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termite</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Design Temperature</td>
<td>12°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Hazards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Winter Temp</td>
<td>-2°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Winter Wind Speed</td>
<td>4.8 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating Degree Days</td>
<td>9004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 3, 2012

Mr. Dee High
DHI CONSULTING ENGINEERS
Sent by email: deeh@dhialaska.com

Dee:
Here’s some preliminary notes regarding our phone conversation & email:

Cordova plans to adopt the 2006 editions of the International Building Code (IBC), and International Residential Code (IRC), and is considering local amendments.

I assume that "Seismic zone E" in this case refers to "Seismic Design Category (SDC) E", which is used in both codes and is mapped by the IRC.

The IRC map is pretty small, but it looks like Cordova is within SDC="D2" & close to SDC="E". USGS's website gives SDC= "E" near the Cordova airport for Soil Type “D” (stiff soil). See the USGS notes below.

IBC Seismic Design Category (SDC) is determined by soil type, ground acceleration, and building occupancy. SDC is used along with construction type (steel, wood, etc.), structural system: bearing & shear walls, frames, bracing, etc, and other factors to estimate the response of the building under seismic ground motion.

The SDC value is also used to limit building heights, encourage ductility, and discourage some types of construction, and to discourage buildings in highly active seismic areas on poor soil.

It seems reasonable that a local amendment to the IRC might include a requirement that a design must provide for a minimum of SDC = “E” for stiff soil. This might be given as appropriate replacement text in relevant sections of the code.

This amendment would not be appropriate for the IBC, though others might be considered.

Please let me know if I can be of any more help on this.
USGS:

Sincerely:

Steve Grand PE
Grand Engineering LLC
### Significant Changes to the IRC – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Topic</th>
<th>2006 IRC</th>
<th>2009 IRC</th>
<th>Notes/Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope and Administration (Chapter 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R101.2 Modification: ‘Grade Plane’ replaces the word ‘grade’ in determining the story limitations.</td>
<td>IRC provisions applies to 1-2 family dwellings &amp; townhouses not more than 3 stories above grade.</td>
<td>Grade plane is an average of the finished ground level measured at the lowest point within 6 feet of the exterior wall. <em>In practice new language will not change the outcome in most cases.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R101.2 Addition: A new exception allows a mix of residential &amp; non-residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires fire suppressions per 419.5 of the IBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R105.2 Modification: The floor area for accessory structures that are exempt from permits has increased from 120 to 200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>The permit exemption was reduced to 120 sq. ft. due to concerns about building garages.</td>
<td>The permit exemption went back to 2003 standards.</td>
<td>Unattached decks 200 sq. ft. or under &amp; not serving as required exit door &amp; not more than 30 in. above grade do not need a permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R105.2 Modification: The code now provides a list of electrical repairs &amp; installations considered sufficiently routine to forgo permitting &amp; inspection as previous language was deemed too vague &amp; subjective.</td>
<td>Electrical – A permit shall not be required for minor repair work.</td>
<td>Electrical: 1. Listed cord and plug connected temporary lighting. 2. Reinstallation of attachment plug receptacles but not the outlets therefore. 3. Replacement of branch circuit overcurrent devices of the required capacity in the same location. 5. Electrical wiring, devices appliances, apparatus or equipment operating at less than 25 volts and not capable of supplying more than 50 watts of energy.</td>
<td>Minor repair work remains in the list giving discretion to the building official to make a determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R106.1.1 Modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As with other submittals, the building official is authorized to decide if such information is necessary for a particular project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitions (Chapter 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R202 Addition: Attic definition has been revised &amp; a new definition for habitable attic has been added in order to be more inclusive.</td>
<td>The unfinished space between the ceiling joists of the top story &amp; the roof rafters.</td>
<td>The unfinished space between the ceiling assembly of the top story and the roof assembly. Attic, Habitable: A finished or unfinished area, not considered a story, complying with the following: 1. Occupiable floor area is at least 70 square feet. 2. Occupiable floor area has Habitable attics are not considered a story, but must meet minimum room size &amp; ceiling height requirements, require a smoke detector, emergency escape and rescue opening and means of egress complying with R311.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Attachment D**

**Quick Reference Sheet**

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**
**DECEMBER 9, 2014**

**Significant Changes to the IRC – 2009**

**Scope and Administration (Chapter 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Topic</th>
<th>2006 IRC</th>
<th>2009 IRC</th>
<th>Notes/Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R101.2 Modification: ‘Grade Plane’ replaces the word ‘grade’ in determining the story limitations.</td>
<td>IRC provisions applies to 1-2 family dwellings &amp; townhouses not more than 3 stories above grade.</td>
<td>Grade plane is an average of the finished ground level measured at the lowest point within 6 feet of the exterior wall. In practice new language will not change the outcome in most cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R101.2 Addition: A new exception allows a mix of residential &amp; non-residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires fire suppressions per 419.5 of the IBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R105.2 Modification: The floor area for accessory structures that are exempt from permits has increased from 120 to 200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>The permit exemption was reduced to 120 sq. ft. due to concerns about building garages.</td>
<td>The permit exemption went back to 2003 standards.</td>
<td>Unattached decks 200 sq. ft. or under &amp; not serving as required exit door &amp; not more than 30 in. above grade do not need a permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R105.2 Modification: The code now provides a list of electrical repairs &amp; installations considered sufficiently routine to forgo permitting &amp; inspection as previous language was deemed too vague &amp; subjective.</td>
<td>Electrical – A permit shall not be required for minor repair work.</td>
<td>Electrical: 1. Listed cord and plug connected temporary lighting. 2. Reinstallation of attachment plug receptacles but not the outlets therefore. 3. Replacement of branch circuit overcurrent devices of the required capacity in the same location. 5. Electrical wiring, devices appliances, apparatus or equipment operating at less than 25 volts and not capable of supplying more than 50 watts of energy.</td>
<td>Minor repair work remains in the list giving discretion to the building official to make a determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R106.1.1 Modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As with other submittals, the building official is authorized to decide if such information is necessary for a particular project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitions (Chapter 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R202 Addition: Attic definition has been revised &amp; a new definition for habitable attic has been added in order to be more inclusive.</td>
<td>The unfinished space between the ceiling joists of the top story &amp; the roof rafters.</td>
<td>The unfinished space between the ceiling assembly of the top story and the roof assembly. Attic, Habitable: A finished or unfinished area, not considered a story, complying with the following: 1. Occupiable floor area is at least 70 square feet. 2. Occupiable floor area has Habitable attics are not considered a story, but must meet minimum room size &amp; ceiling height requirements, require a smoke detector, emergency escape and rescue opening and means of egress complying with R311.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R202 Modification: Definitions for labeled & listed have been revised for clarity & consistency.

The code now clarifies that the testing laboratory or testing agency must be nationally recognized.

R202 Addition: IRC now includes prescriptive methods of construction using structural insulated panels (SIPs) with new definitions.

SIP – Factory fabricated panels of solid core insulation with structural skins of oriented strand board (OSB) or plywood.

SIP – A structural sandwich panel that consists of a light-weight foam plastic core securely laminated between 2 thin, rigid wood structural panel facings.

Added definitions for:
- Cap Plate
- Core
- Facing
- Spline

Building Planning (Chapter 3)

R301.1.1 Modification: The IRC now recognizes a recently developed standard for log construction & the reference standard for cold formed steel framing has been updated.

2 – American Iron & Steel Institute (AISI) Standard for Cold Formed Steel Framing (COFS/PM) with Supplement to Standard for Cold-Formed Steel Framing – Prescriptive Method for 1 & 2 Family Dwellings.

Year 2004 AISI has been replaced with year 2007 AISI 230.


The prescriptive methods for cold-formed steel framing now apply to 3 story buildings – an increase from an allowable 2 stories in the previous standard & the 2006 IRC & are consistent with the height limits of conventional wood frame construction.

R301.2.1.1 Modification: The IRC now recognizes structural insulated panel (SIP) construction for high wind areas – bringing the list of design alternatives to 6.

1 - American Forest & Paper Association (AF&PA) Wood Frame Construction Manual for 1-2 Family Dwellings (WCFM); or
3 – Minimum Design Loads for Buildings & Other Structures (ACSE 7); or
4 – American Iron & Steel Institute (AISI), Standard for Cold Formed Steel Framing – Prescriptive Method for 1-2 Family Dwellings (COFS/PM).

4 – AISI S230 replaces AISI.
6 – Structural insulated panel (SIP) walls shall be designated in accordance with the provisions of this code.

R301.2.1.2 & Table R301.2.1.2 Modification: Protection of glazed openings for garage doors is now specifically required in windborne debris region.

When wood structural panels are used for any opening protection, they must be predrilled & the mounting hardware must be permanently attached to the building to ease installation. The
prescriptive methods for attaching wood structural panels now require additional anchors with greater embedment depth & resistance.

The testing of the garage door in accordance with ANSI/DASMA 115 is also used to determine compliance with the component and cladding loads of Table R301.2.

- **R301.2.1.5 and Table R301.2**
  - **Addition:**
    Under very limited circumstances in localized geographic areas, design of buildings sited on a hill, ridge, or escarpment must consider the effects of topographic wind speedup.

- **R301.2.2 Seismic Provisions Clarification**
  - Reorganization of the seismic provisions clarifies the design application within each seismic design category.

- **R301.2.3 Snowloads**
  - **Modification:**
    Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs) have been added to the list of approved prescriptive construction methods that are limited to a maximum ground snow load of 70 psf.

- **R301.3 Story Height**
  - **Modification:**
    Floor framing is now permitted to exceed 16 in. provided the overall story height is not exceeded. SIP bearing walls are limited to 10 ft. in height.

- **Table R301.5 Minimum Uniformly Distributed Live Loads**
  - **Modification:**
    The definitions for deck and balcony have been removed & the minimum uniform live load for balconies has been lowered.

The code limited story height to the sum of the tabular value for stud wall height plus 16 in. for the floor framing height in order to limit story height, measured from the finished floor surface one 1 story to the finished floor of the next story.

The new language permits floor framing to exceed the 16 in. height limit provided the story height does not exceed 11ft. 7 in.

For masonry walls, a maximum bearing wall clear height of 12 ft. plus a height of floor framing not to exceed 16 in.

The minimum live load for balconies has been lowered from 60 psf to 40 psf to be consistent with decks as both perform the same function.

Habitable attics & attics served

The provisions for topographic wind speedup effects apply only where there are historical data of structural damage from such effects. These circumstances are most likely to occur in areas of the Pacific Northwest where there are dramatic changes in ground topography.

To determine wind speedup engineered designs according to ASCE 7 may be required or one may use the simplified method to design for an increased basic wind speed based on the slope of the topographic feature in accordance with Table R301.2.1.5.1.

The provisions for topographic wind speedup effects apply only where there are historical data of structural damage from such effects. These circumstances are most likely to occur in areas of the Pacific Northwest where there are dramatic changes in ground topography.

The provisions for topographic wind speedup effects apply only where there are historical data of structural damage from such effects. These circumstances are most likely to occur in areas of the Pacific Northwest where there are dramatic changes in ground topography.

For wood framed wall buildings with bracing in accordance with Tables R602.10.1.2(1) and R602.3(5), the wall stud clear height may be increased to 12 ft. without requiring an engineered design.

For wood framed wall buildings with bracing in accordance with Tables R602.10.1.2(1) and R602.3(5), the wall stud clear height may be increased to 12 ft. without requiring an engineered design.

Habitable attics & attics served

A new defined term in the 2009 IRC, habitable attics are occupiable space between the uppermost floor/ceiling assembly & the roof assembly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Changes to the text of the various sections that are brought into R302 are minor &amp; editorial.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R302.1 and Table R302.1 Fire Resistant Construction at Exterior Walls Modification: R302 has been renamed Fire-Resistant Construction &amp; pulls in related provisions from sections on separations, penetrations, and other fire-resistance requirements so that they reside in 1 section &amp; can be more easily located.</td>
<td>Construction, projections, openings &amp; penetration of exterior walls of dwellings &amp; accessory buildings shall comply with Table 302.1. These provisions shall not apply to walls, projections, openings or penetrations in walls that are perpendicular to the line used to determine the fire separation distance.</td>
<td>All fire-resistance provisions have been reorganized &amp; placed into Section R302. Exterior walls requiring a 1 hour fire-resistance rating due to fire separation distance must now meet requirements of ASTM E 119 or UL 263. Fire separation distances no longer apply to buildings on the same lot – no separation distance or fire-resistance rating is required between detached structures on the same lot. Changes to Table 302.1 clarify the application of the fire separation distance requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R302.2 &amp; R302.3 Dwelling Unit Separation Modification: The dwelling unit separation provisions have been relocated from Section R317 to R302.</td>
<td>302.3 - Detached garages accessory to a dwelling located within 2ft. of a lot line are permitted to have roof eave projections not exceeding 4 in. 302.3 – Foundation vents installed in compliance with this code are permitted.</td>
<td>The fire-resistance rating for the common wall between townhouses has been reduced from 2 hours to 1 hour as fire sprinklers are now required in all new townhouses. Each townhouse shall be considered a separate building &amp; shall be separated by fire-resistance-rated wall assemblies meeting the requirements of Section R302.1. Each individual townhouse shall be structurally independent. Dwelling units in 2 family dwellings shall be separated from each other by wall and/or floor assemblies having not less than 1 hour fire-resistance-rating when tested. The code now recognizes UL 263 as an equivalent test standard to ASTM E 119 for fire-resistance. A common 1 hour fire resistance rated wall satisfies the townhouse separation requirements. The 1 hour fire-resistance rating wall assembly is permitted if the walls do not contain plumbing, or mechanical equipment, ducts or vents in the cavity of the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R302.4 Rated Penetrations for Dwelling Unit Separation Modification: The rated penetration provisions for dwelling unit separation have been relocated from Section R317 to Section R302.</td>
<td>R317.1 has been replaced with R302.1. R317.2 has been replaced with R302.3. R317.3.1.1 has been replaced with R302.4.1.1 with no changes to the text. R317.3.1.2 has been replaced with R302.4.1.2 with no changes to the text.</td>
<td>The exception to Section R302.4.1 permits penetrating items of specified metal pipe or conduit in 2 instances in lieu of a listed assembly or penetration firestop system. In the 1st instance, firestopping materials may be concrete, grout, or masonry. In the 2nd instance, the code now recognizes UL 263 as an equivalent test standard to ASTM E 119.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R302.5 Garage Openings & Penetrations Modification: The dwelling/garage separation provisions in Sections R309.1 & R309.2 of the 2006 IRC have been relocated to Section R302 with the other fire-resistant construction provisions.

See Sections R309.1 & R309.2. Penetrations other than ducts required the opening around the penetrating item to be filled with approved material to restrict passage of combustion products.

Openings & penetrations through the walls or ceilings separating the dwelling from the garage shall be in accordance with Section R302.5.1 through R302.5.3. Penetration requirements reference the fireblocking provisions (previously R602.8) have been relocated to Section R302.11.

R302.11 requires fireblocking to cut off all concealed draft openings & to form an effective fire barrier between stories & between a top story & the roof space.

The application of this change is to seal around openings of pipes, vents, cables, and wires penetrating the separation at the floor & ceiling level.

The provisions for door openings & duct penetrations through the separation between the dwelling & the garage have not changed.

R305.1 Minimum Ceiling Height Modification: Ceiling Height requirements have been reorganized for clarification.

Habitable rooms, hallways, corridors, bathrooms, toilet rooms, laundry rooms and basements shall have a ceiling height of not less than 7 ft.

The 7 ft. ceiling height now specifically applies to habitable space as defined in Section R 202, hallways, bathrooms, toilet rooms, and laundry rooms.

Bathrooms shall have a minimum ceiling height of 6 ft. 8 in. at the center of the front clearance area for fixtures as shown in Figure R307.1

Provisions for lower ceiling heights in portions of basement used for utility & storage have been moved to a separate subsection.

For rooms with sloped ceilings, at least 50% of the required floor area of the room must have a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R308.1 &amp; R308.3 Identification of Glazing &amp; Human Impact Loads Modification:</th>
<th>ceiling height of 7 ft with no ceiling height less than 5 ft.</th>
<th>The code now recognizes ANSI Z97.1 as an alternative test procedure to CPSC 16 CFR 1201 for safety glazing products not regulated by the federal standard.</th>
<th>The major difference between the 2 standards is their scope &amp; function. The CPSC requires the installation of safety glazing materials meeting 16 CFR 1201 only in storm doors, combination doors, entrance-exit doors, sliding patio doors, closet doors, and shower &amp; tub doors &amp; enclosures. For other locations requiring safety glazing under the IRC, the code now recognizes testing with ANSI Z97.1 as well.</th>
<th>In an editorial change, exceptions from R308.4 have been relocated to Section R308.3 where they are more appropriately placed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R308.4 Hazardous Locations Requiring Safety Glazing Modification: Requirements for safety glazing at hazardous locations subject to human impact have been reorganized in an easy to use format.</td>
<td>The 2006 IRC code identified 11 hazardous locations requiring safety glazing &amp; in a separate list, provided 10 exceptions, each of which applied to 1 or more of the hazardous locations.</td>
<td>The 2009 code clarifies the application of the provisions by deleting repetitive or unnecessary language, organizing the material in logical manner, and moving exceptions to directly follow the rule to which they apply. The 11 rules of 2006 have been reduced to 8 by merging the information related to safety glazing in doors.</td>
<td>The 2009 change is largely editorial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R310.1 Emergency Escape &amp; Rescue Openings Modification: Habitable attics have been added to the locations requiring an emergency escape &amp; rescue opening.</td>
<td>Basements &amp; every sleeping room shall have at least 1 operable emergency escape &amp; rescue opening.</td>
<td>Habitable attics are considered spaces for sleeping &amp; so shall require an emergency escape &amp; opening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R311 Egress Modification: The means of egress provisions have been reorganized in a systematic order to provide a better understanding of the requirements.</td>
<td>Stairways, ramps, exterior egress balconies, hallways &amp; doors shall comply with all sections of the code. All egress doors shall be readily openable in the direction of the egress. A door with a nominal size of 3ft. by 6ft 8in. satisfied the size requirements for the 1 required exit door.</td>
<td>New language clarifies that the means of egress in the IRC ends when the occupant reaches grade at the exterior of the building &amp; there are no requirements beyond that point. Net clear opening requirements have replaced the nominal door size for the required egress door to the exterior. The means of egress shall provide a continuous &amp; unobstructed path of vertical and horizontal egress travel from all portions of the dwelling to the exterior of the dwelling at the required egress door without requiring travel through a garage. Habitable attics require a stair or ramp meeting the egress provisions of Section R311. The word ‘egress’ replaces the word ‘exit’ for the requirements of at least 1 egress door in Section 311.2. Now only the 1 required</td>
<td>The revision of the entire section organizes provisions in a user-friendly format but intends only minor technical changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
egress door must be readily openable from the inside of the building.

The code now specifies that the required net clear opening dimensions & the method for measuring when the door is opened to the 90 degree position. The minimum net opening dimensions are now consistent with the door requirements for means of egress & accessibility for persons with disabilities in the IBC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R311.7.2 Stairway Headroom Modification: The minimum headroom is measure above the usable area of the treads in an open stairway &amp; does not apply to the ends of treads where they project under the edge of the floor opening above.</th>
<th>R311.5.2 states that the minimum headroom in all parts of the stairway shall not be less than 6ft. 8 in. measured vertically from the sloped plane adjoining the tread nosing or from the floor surface of the landing or platform.</th>
<th>R311.7.2 replaces R311.5.2. The code now more clearly states the intent that minimum stair headroom height is required above only the area where a person normally walks on the stair. The exception states that where the nosing of treads at the side of a flight extend under the edge of a floor opening through which the stair passes, the floor opening shall be allowed to project horizontally into the required headroom a maximum of 4 ¾ in. The code change permits stair openings &amp; support walls to be positioned in line in the vertical plane without creating any hazard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R311.7.3 &amp; R311.7.4 Stair Treads &amp; Risers Modification: New provisions defining the walk line intend to clarify the tread depth requirements for winders.</td>
<td>See R311.5.3.</td>
<td>R311.7.3 replaces R311.5.3. The walk line across winder treads shall be concentric to the curved direction of travel through the turn &amp; located 12 in. from the side of where the winders are narrower. The 12in. standard dimension shall be measured from the widest point of the clear stair width at the walking surface of the winder. If the winders are adjacent within the flight, the point of the widest stair width of the adjacent winders shall be used. R311.7.4.1 replaces R311.5.3.1. For the purpose of this section all dimensions &amp; dimensional surfaces shall be exclusive of carpets, rugs, or runners. R311.7.4.1 replaces R311.5.1 but does not change the text. R311.7.4.2 replaces R311.5.3.2. The minimum tread depth shall be 10in. It shall be measure horizontally between the vertical planes of the foremost projection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The IRC now provides for measurement of stair risers before carpet is installed. Carpet is not regulated by the code but is commonly considered in measuring stair riser height. Carpet may not be installed at the time of the final inspection or initial occupancy. A nosing is not required where the tread depth is a minimum of 11 in. The opening between adjacent treads is not limited on stairs with a total rise of 30 in. or less.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of adjacent treads & at a right angle to the tread’s leading edge. The greatest tread depth within any flight of stairs shall not exceed the smallest by more 3/8 in. Consistently shaped winders at the walk line shall be allowed within the same flight of stairs as rectangular treads & do not have to be within 3/8in. of the rectangular tread depth. Winder treads shall have a minimum tread depth of 6 in. at any point within the clear width of the stair. Within any flight of stairs, the largest winder tread depth at the walk line shall not exceed the smallest by more than 3/8 in.

R311.7.4.3 replaces R311.5.3. The radius of curvature at the nosing shall be no greater than 9/16in. Risers shall be vertical or sloped under the tread above the underside of the nosing above at an angle not more than 30 degrees from the vertical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R311.7.7 Handrails Modification: Transition changes are now permitted to exceed the maximum handrail height of 38 in.</th>
<th>R311.5.6</th>
<th>R311.7.7 replaces R311.5.6 with no change of text. R311.7.7.1 replaces R311.5.6.1 with no change of text. However, the use of a volute, turnout, or starting easing shall be allowed over the lowest tread. The other exception is that when handrail fittings or bendings are used to provide continuous between flights, the transition from handrail height at the fittings or bendings shall be permitted to exceed the maximum height. R311.7.7.2 replaces R311.5.6.2 with change of text. R311.7.7.3 replaces R311.5.6.3 with no change of text except for Type I handrails, which adds that edges shall have a minimum radius of .01 in. An editorial change clarifies that Type I handrails must have rounded edges consistent with the description of Type II handrails.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

R312 Guards Modification: The provisions for guards have been reorganized into 3 separate sections – required locations, height, and opening limitations – and the technical provisions revised for clarification & consistency in application.

| See R312 — Porches, balconies, ramps or raised floor surfaces located more than 30 in. above the floor or grade below shall have guards not less than 36 in. in height. Open sides of stairs with a total rise of more than 30 in. above the floor or grade below shall have guards not less than 34 in. in height measured Guards shall be located along open sided walking surfaces, including stairs, ramps, landings, that are located more than 30 in. measured vertically to the floor or grade below at any point within 36 in. horizontally to the edge of the open side. Insect screening shall not be considered as a guard. The first section now only determines where guards are required & gives an objective means for measuring the height of the walking surface above the grade below. |
| --- | --- | --- |
vertically from the nosing of the treads.

Porches & decks which are enclosed with insect screening shall be equipped where the walking surface is located more than 30 in. above the floor or grade below.

R312.2 Guard Opening Limitations – Required guards on open sides of stairways, raised floor areas, balconies and porches shall have intermediate rails or ornamental closures which do not allow passage of a sphere of 4 in. or more in diameter. 2 exceptions are listed.

R312.3 replaces R 312.2. It takes out the word ‘Guard’ from ‘Guard Opening Limitations.’ Required guards shall not have openings from the walking surface to the required guard height which allow passage of a sphere of 4in. in diameter with the 2 exceptions also modified.

R313 Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems Addition: An automatic fire sprinkler system is now required in 1-2 family dwellings & townhouses. An automatic fire sprinkler system installed in accordance with IRC Section P2904 or NFPA 13D is now required for 1-2 family dwellings & townhouses.

In 1-2 family dwellings the ruling will not take effect until Jan 1, 2011.

The new standards uses less water, may be taken from water wells, and do not need to be placed in every room.

R314 Smoke Alarms Clarification: New text clarifies the maintenance & supervision requirements for household fire alarm systems. See R 313.1

Reorganization of the smoke alarm provisions places all of the power requirements in 1 section and separates the alternative household fire alarm systems from the smoke alarm section.

Section R314 replaces Section R313 with some editing.

Where a household fire warning system is installed using a combination of smoke detector & audible notification devices, it shall become a permanent fixture of the occupancy & owned by the homeowner. The system shall be monitored by an approved supervising station & be maintained in accordance with NFPA 72.

Exception 1 from the old R313.2.1 has been removed.

R314.4 replaces R 313.3 and says that smoke alarms shall be interconnected. It also takes away a section from the old ruling & replaces it with 2 exceptions.

The requirement in the 2006 IRC for the household fire alarm systems to operate if the panel was removed has been deleted & language added to clarify these provisions. Such a system cannot function if the fire alarm panel is removed. The added language ensures system reliability by requiring the system to be owned by the occupant & to be electronically monitored & maintained.
### R315 Carbon Monoxide Alarms

**Addition:**

Carbon monoxide alarms in new dwellings & in existing dwellings are required when work requiring a permit takes place.

- R315.1 states that for new construction, an approved carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of each separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedrooms in dwelling units within which fuel fired appliances are installed & in dwelling units that have detached garages.

- R315.2 states that where work requiring a permit occurs in existing dwellings that have attached garages or in existing dwellings within which fuel fire appliances exist, carbon monoxide alarms shall be provided in accordance with Section R315.1.

- R315.3 says that single station carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 & shall be installed in accordance with this code & the manufacturer's installation instructions.

### R317 Locations for Protection Against Decay Modification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R317.1 Locations for Protection Against Decay Modification: Protection from decay is now required for wood siding &amp; wall framing less than 2 in. above a concrete slab exposed to weather.</th>
<th>See Section R319</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R317.1 replaces 319.1 but with only 1 text change from no. 5 where the new provision is added in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R317.3 Fasteners & Connectors in Contact with Treated Wood Modification:

- The fastener requirements have been expanded to include fasteners & connectors in contact with preservative-treated & fire-retardant-treated wood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R319.3 says that fasteners for pressure-preservative &amp; fire-retardant-treated wood shall be hot-dipped zinc-coated galvanized steel, stainless steel, silicon bronze or copper with 2 exceptions given.</th>
<th>R317.3 replaces R319.3 and says that fasteners and connectors in contact with pressure-treated wood &amp; fire-retardant-treated wood shall be in accordance with this section. It keeps the 2 exceptions the same but does change out ‘larger’ with ‘greater’ in the first exception.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R317.3.1 states that fasteners for preservative-treated wood shall be hot dipped zinc-coated galvanize steel, stainless steel, silicon, bronze or copper. Coating types &amp; weights for connectors in contact with preservative treated wood shall be in accordance with the connector’s manufacturer’s recommendations, a minimum of ASTM A 635 type G185 zinc-coated galvanized steel, or equivalent, shall be used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R317.3.2 states that fastenings</td>
<td>Changes to this section related to fasteners &amp; connectors in contact with preservative treated wood intend to clarify the applicable reference standards &amp; the minimum zinc coating weights for galvanized products. The standards are different for fasteners &amp; connectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R317.3.3</td>
<td>States that fasteners for fire retardant treated wood used in exterior applications or wet or damp locations shall be of hot dipped zinc coated galvanized steel, stainless steel, silicon, bronze or copper. Fasteners other than nails &amp; timber rivets shall be permitted to be mechanically deposited zinc-coated steel with coating weights in accordance with ASTM B 695, Class 55 minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R317.3.4</td>
<td>Says that fasteners for fire retardant treated wood used in interior locations shall be in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. In the absence of the manufacturer's recommendations, Section R317.3.3 shall apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R317.4</td>
<td>Wood/Plastic Composites Addition: Wood plastic composites were used with the approval of the building official under the alternative materials &amp; methods of construction provisions based on available data from the manufacturer &amp; other sources such as ICC Evaluation Services (ES) reports. R317.4 states that wood/plastic composites used in exterior deck boards, stair treads, handrails and guardrail systems shall bear a label indicating the required performance levels &amp; demonstrating compliance with the provisions of ASTM D 7032.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R318.1</td>
<td>Subterranean Termite Control Methods Modification: When used for protection against termite damage, pressure-preservative-treated wood must now meet the location requirements for protection against decay in R317 in addition to the AWPA standards. R318.1 replaces R320.1 with a few minor changes. The definition of naturally resistant wood has been removed from Section R318 &amp; revised definitions for naturally durable wood &amp; termite-resistant material have been placed in Section R202. Steel is now specifically recognized as being termite resistant. Alaska yellow cedar &amp; western red cedar have been included in the list of termite resistant woods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R319.1</td>
<td>Address Numbers Modification: The IRC now prescribes the minimum size of address numbers &amp; requires a contrasting background for visibility. R319.1 replaces 321.1. Address numbers shall be Arabic numbers or alphabetical letters. Numbers shall be a minimum of 4 in. high with a minimum stroke width of ½ in. Where access is by means of private road &amp; the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R322</td>
<td>Flood Resistant Construction Modification: The code now directly references ASCE 24 for the design &amp; construction of buildings or structures in floodways &amp; coastal high hazard V zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R323</td>
<td>Storm Shelters Addition: Storm shelters must be constructed in accordance with the new ICC/NSSA-500 Standard on the Design &amp; Construction of Storm Shelters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R401.3</td>
<td>Surface Drainage Modification: Where it is not feasible to provide the prescribed fall of 6 in. within the first 10 ft. away from a foundation, the code includes new performance language requiring drainage away from the foundation without prescribing a slope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R401.4 Soil Tests Modification: The revised text defines the necessary criteria for requiring a soil test in more objective terms based on available scientific data.</td>
<td>The 2006 language giving authority to require a soil test was deemed subjective &amp; open to various interpretations. At issue was the opening phrase ‘in areas likely to have.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R402.3 Precast Concrete Foundation Materials Modification: Minimum specifications for materials used in the manufacture of precast concrete foundations have been added to the code.</td>
<td>Approved precast concrete foundations shall be designed &amp; installed in accordance with the provisions of this code and the manufacturer’s installation instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R403.1.3.2 Seismic Reinforcing for Slabs-on-Ground with Turned Down Footings Modification: For turned-down footings in Seismic Design Categories (SDCs) D0, D1 &amp; D2, this change clarifies that the exception permitting bars in the middle of the footing depth is an alternative to the top &amp; bottom bar location of horizontal reinforcing in the footing.</td>
<td>The footings generally require a minimum of 1 No. 4 horizontal reinforcing bar continuous at the bottom of the footing. The exception allowed for greater reinforcing – 1 No. 5 bar or 2 No. 4 bars – located in the middle third of the footing depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R403.1.6 Foundation Anchorage Modification: The revision &amp; reorganization of Section R403.1.6 removes redundant language &amp; clarifies the anchorage requirements for wood sill &amp; sole plates resting on concrete &amp; masonry foundations.</td>
<td>When braced wall panels are supported directly on continuous foundations, the wood sill plate or cold formed steel bottom track shall be anchored to the foundation in accordance with this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that this section applies to anchorage of wood sill & sole plates to continuous foundations.
R403.4 Footings for Precast Foundations Addition:
Prescriptive requirements for crushed stone footings supporting precast concrete foundations are now included in the code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R403.4 Footings for precast concrete foundations shall comply with Section R403.4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R403.4.1 Clean crushed stone shall be free from organic, clayey, or silty soils. Crushed stone shall be angular in nature &amp; meet ASTM C 33, with the maximum size stone not to exceed ½ in. &amp; the minimum stone size not to be smaller than 1/16 in. Crushed stone footings for precast foundations shall be installed in accordance with Figure R403.4 (1) &amp; Table R403.4. Crushed stone footings shall be consolidated using a vibratory in maximum of 8 in. lifts. Crushed stone footings shall be limited to Seismic Design Categories A, B, &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R403.4.2 Concrete footings shall be installed in accordance with Section R403.1 &amp; Figure R403.4 (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed stone footings for precast concrete foundations are not allowed for building sites in Seismic Design Categories D0, D1, &amp; D2. Requirements for concrete footings supporting precast concrete foundation walls match those for masonry &amp; cast-in-place concrete foundation walls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables R404.1(1) through R404.1(3) Deletion:
The prescriptive lateral restraints provisions for the top of concrete & masonry foundation walls based on soil type, height of wall, and unbalanced backfill height have been removed from the code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tables R404.1(1) through R404.1(3) Deletion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The prescriptive lateral restraint provisions brings the 2009 IRC into agreement with the 2000 &amp; 2003 editions. Proponents of removing the top of foundation wall lateral restraint provisions reasoned that the traditional prescriptive provisions for anchor bolts &amp; floor systems connections have performed well for many years without substantiated problems or failures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R404.1 Concrete & Masonry Foundation Walls Modification:
The technical provisions for concrete foundation walls have been substantially revised & are now separated from the masonry foundation provisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R404.1 Concrete &amp; Masonry Foundation Walls Modification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See 404.1 – in the 2006 IRC, the tables for removable form concrete walls required a yield strength of 60,000 psi (Grade 60) reinforcing steel, and the tables for ICF walls required 40,000 psi (Grade 40) steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescriptive concrete provisions for Section 404.1 are based on PCA 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tabular values for vertical reinforcement are revised to reflect changes to the referenced standards ACI 318 &amp; ASCE 7. In addition to the provisions of the referenced standards ACI 318 &amp; ACI 332, PCA 100 is referenced as another option for alternate design of concrete foundation walls that are beyond the scope of prescriptive provisions of the IRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With these changes, the prescriptive provisions for concrete foundation walls are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2009 IRC revises the prescriptive concrete foundation wall requirements to reflect the provisions of the new referenced Portland Cement Association standard PCA 100 Prescriptive Design of Exterior Concrete Walls for 1-2 family dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more comprehensive. New provisions govern the location, cover, and continuity of reinforcement, lap splices & standard hooks, and installation of construction joints. The provisions also incorporate technical requirements for constructing concrete stem wall foundations not presently in the code.

The vertical reinforcement tables for both removable form concrete walls & ICF walls are now based on reinforcement steel with a yield strength of 60,000 psi (Grade 60). However, a new table provides more flexibility for the use of different bar sizes or grades of steel than specified in other tables.

The IRC now specifies the material & placement requirements for concrete mixing, delivery, aggregate size, proportioning, slump & consolidation (vibration). New requirements also specify approved materials for forms & form ties.

<p>| R404.5 Precast Concrete Foundation Walls Addition:  This new section in the IRC requires engineering &amp; sets designs &amp; labeling requirements for precast foundation walls. | R404.5 – the design &amp; manufacture of precast concrete foundation wall panels shall comply with the materials requirements of Section R402.3 or ACI 318. The panel design drawings shall be prepared by a registered design professional where required by the statutes of the jurisdiction in which the project is to be constructed in accordance with Section R106.1. R404.5.2 – precast concrete foundation wall design drawings shall be submitted to the building official &amp; approved prior to installation. Drawings shall include Design Loading, Footing Design, Concentrated Loads &amp; their points of application, Soil-Bearing Capacity, Maximum Allowable Total Uniform Load, Seismic Design Category, and Basic Wind Speed. R404.5.3 – precast concrete foundation wall panels shall be identified by a certificate of  | The minimum performance design criteria in Section R404.5 do not favor or exclude any specific system, providing neutral &amp; nonproprietary requirements.  |
| <strong>R405.1.1 Precast Concrete Foundation Drainage Addition:</strong> | <strong>R405.1.1</strong> – precast concrete walls that retain earth &amp; enclose habitable or useable space located below grade that rest on crushed stone footings shall have a perforated drainage pipe installed below the base of a wall on either the interior or exterior side of the wall, at least 1 ft. beyond the edge of the wall. If the exterior drainage pipe is used, an approved filter membrane material shall cover the pipe. The drainage system shall discharge into an approved sewer system or to daylight. | The type &amp; location of the drainage pipe is instrumental in preserving the bearing capabilities of the crushed stone footing. |
| Drainage pipe must be installed a minimum of 1 ft. beyond the edge of a wall to preserve the integrity of the effective bearing surface of the crushed stone footing. |inspection label issued by an approved 3rd party inspection agency. | |
| <strong>R406.4 Precast Concrete Foundation System Dampproofing Addition:</strong> | <strong>R406.4</strong> – except where required by Section R406.2 to be waterproofed, precast concrete foundation walls enclosing habitable or useable spaces located below grade shall be dampproofed in accordance with Section R406.1. | The new reference to Schedule 40 pipe manufactured in accordance with ASTM A 53 Grade B clearly defines the wall thickness &amp; strength properties required for steel pipe columns. The code still recognizes other steel columns that provide equivalent performance characteristics. |
| Precast concrete basement foundations require panel joints to be filled &amp; sealed and the exterior below-grade surface to be dampproofed to prevent water intrusion into the below grade space. | R406.4.1 – precast concrete foundation panel joints shall be sealed full height with a sealant meeting ASTM C 920, Type S or M, Grade NS, Class 25, Use NT, M, or A. Joint sealant shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer’s installation instructions. | The previous reference to standard pipe for steel columns became unfamiliar to inspectors over time, resulting in a perceived inconsistent application of the requirement. |
| <strong>R407.3 Steel Columns Clarification:</strong> | The columns shall be restrained to prevent lateral displacement at the bottom end. Wood columns shall not be less than in nominal size than 4x4 in. and steel columns shall not be less than 3 in. diameter standard pipe or approved equivalent. | Polyethylene sheeting is the most commonly used material to satisfy the requirement of Class I vapor retarder. |
| Steel Columns must be fabricated or not less than 3 in. diameter Schedule 40 pipe. | The new reference to Schedule 40 pipe manufactured in accordance with ASTM A 53 Grade B clearly defines the wall thickness &amp; strength properties required for steel pipe columns. The code still recognizes other steel columns that provide equivalent performance characteristics. | |
| <strong>R408.1 &amp; R408.2 Underfloor Space Ventilation Modification:</strong> | See R408.1 - the 2006 IRC deleted a provision for reduced ventilation of crawl space where a vapor retarder covered the ground of the crawl space. | Polyethylene sheeting is the most commonly used material to satisfy the requirement of Class I vapor retarder. |
| This change re-establishes a provision found in the 2003 IRC for reducing the require net area of ventilation openings to 1/1500 of the underfloor area where the ground is covered with a vapor retarder. | R408.1 – the minimum net area of ventilation openings shall not be less than 1 sq. ft. for each 150 sq. ft. of underfloor space area, unless the ground surface is covered by a Class I vapor retarder material. When a Class I vapor retarder material is used, the minimum net area of ventilation openings shall not be less than 1 sq. ft. for each 1500 sq. ft. of underfloor space area. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R408.2</td>
<td>Openings for underfloor ventilation now include the exception that the total area of ventilation openings shall be permitted to be reduced to 1/500 of the underfloor area where the ground surface is covered with an approved Class I vapor retarder material &amp; the required openings are placed so as to provide cross ventilation of the space. The installation of louvers shall not be prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R502.2.2.1 &amp; Table 502.2.2.1</td>
<td>Prescriptive methods for securely attaching a wood deck to the dwelling structure are now included in the IRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R502.7</td>
<td>Lateral Restrain for Wood Joists Clarification: New text clarifies that installation of engineered wood products including lateral support to prevent rotation is determined by the installation instructions of the manufacturer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R505 Cold Formed Steel Floor Framing Modification:</td>
<td>The prescriptive provisions of cold-formed steel framing now apply to 3 story buildings. This section has been reorganized &amp; modified to clarify the application of the code. New provisions, tables &amp; figures provides more options for the design &amp; construction of dwellings using the prescriptive cold-formed steel framing provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 IRC had prescriptive provisions of cold-formed steel framing for up to 2 story buildings.</td>
<td>Section R 505 has undergone significant revision &amp; updating to incorporate provisions of the new American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) Standard for Cold-Formed Steel Framing – Prescriptive Method for 1-2 Family Dwellings (AISI S230-2007). The most notable change is in the scope of application where the height limitation has increased from 2 story to 3 story buildings, consistent with the height limits of conventional wood frame construction. Terminology has been updated throughout the text to reflect current usage by industry &amp; to provide consistency in the code. Many minor modifications improve the organization, clarity &amp; usability of the code provisions. In general the revisions provide more options for the design &amp; construction of dwellings using the prescriptive cold formed steel framing provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 602.3(1) Fastener Schedule for Structural Members Modification: Table R602.3(1) has been reorganized &amp; updated to reflect currently accepted industry standards &amp; manufacturer’s recommendations.</td>
<td>The fastening requirements for solid-sawn lumber framing members in R602.3(1) have been reorganized into 4 categories related to roof, wall, floor &amp; beam/girder locations, and each condition has been given an item number. The fastening requirements for ceiling joist &amp; rafter tie connections to rafters have been deleted because these connection requirements appear in Table R802.5.1.9, Rafter/Ceiling Joist Heel Joint Connections. The sheathing fastener schedule has been updated to reflect current industry recommendations &amp; commonly used or available materials. Common nails are not recommended for attaching gypsum sheathing. The prescribed fastener spacing at the edges &amp; in the field of gypsum sheathing panels is now 7 in. &amp; matches the attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tolerances for floor joists located in line with cold-formed steel studs have been revised to account for the special case of the bearing stiffener located on the back side of the joist. Provisions concerning web holes &amp; the web hole adjustments have been modified &amp; placed into 1 location. The code user now has the choice to reinforce nonconforming holes, or design nonconforming holes, patch nonconforming holes, or design nonconforming holes in accordance with accepted engineering practice. Provisions for joist bracing &amp; blocking have been divided into 4 distinct sections. 4 tables have been added detailing the design of clip angle bearing stiffeners in order to permit more options for the builder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 602.3(1) Fastener Schedule for Structural Members Modification: Table R602.3(1) has been reorganized & updated to reflect currently accepted industry standards & manufacturer’s recommendations.
**Requirements for Gypsum Board Used as Wall Bracing.**

Wood structural panels with a thickness of 5/16 in. are no longer commonly available or used in construction. The minimum thickness of wood structural panels recognized in Table 602.3(1) is now 3/8 in.

**R602.3 & Table R602.3(3) Wood Structural Panel Wall Sheathing Used to Resist Wind Pressures Modification:**

The component & cladding wind load requirements of Section R301.2.1 & Table R301.2(2) are now referenced in Section R602.3.

Table 602.3(3) provided the minimum thickness of wood structural panels attached to studs 16 in. & 24 in. on center based on the panel floor & roof span rating. Wood structural panel fastening requirements were located in Table 602.3(1).

Wood structural panels used as exterior wall sheathing must comply with the new Table 602.3(3), which now establishes minimum requirements for fastening, panel thickness, span ratings & stud spacing based on designed wind speed & wind exposure category.

Because the changing language of Section R602.10 applies to all exterior walls regardless of the exterior wall type covering type, the reference to the wall bracing section for foam plastic sheathing was considered unnecessary & has been deleted from Section R602.3.

**Table 602.3(5) Size, Height & Spacing of Wood Studs Modification:**

A habitable attic, a new defined term in 2009 IRC, is treated the same as a typical roof & ceiling forming an attic in determining wood stud size & spacing in Table R602.3(5).

Placement of habitable attics in the wood stud table clarifies that wood studs of a size, height & spacing adequate for carrying a roof & ceiling also are adequate for supporting a habitable attic.

Footnote d places a limitation of 32 ft. for the roof span when using 2x4 studs to support a habitable attic. For greater roof spans, the code requires not less than 2x6 studs or an engineered design.

**R602.10 Braced Wall Lines & Braced Wall Panels Modification:**

The wood frame wall bracing provisions of Section R602.10 have been entirely rewritten to provide technical accuracy & clarity.

IRC 2006 definitions were circular in that they used the other term in the definition – a braced wall line was a series of braced wall panels & a braced wall panel was a segment of a braced wall line.

It distinguished between exterior & interior braced wall lines. This led some to believe that the interior braced wall lines had to begin & end inside the building.

The code was silent on mixing various types of bracing methods on the same building, though the practice of mixing methods was very common.

The code no longer differentiates between exterior & interior braced wall lines.

The terms braced wall line & braced wall panel are more precisely defined.

By introducing the term intermittent bracing to define the use of isolated wall panels within a braced wall line, the code now clearly distinguishes the 3 separate paths for compliance with the bracing requirements – the prescriptive methods using intermittent braced wall panels or continuous wall sheathing, or bracing in accordance with an engineered design.

Many of the changes are the result of work by the ICC Ad Hoc Committee on Wall Bracing including engineering analysis of the prescriptive methods used to resist lateral seismic & wind forces.

In a structural sense, all braced wall lines act in the same way regardless where they are located.

By inserting the exemption from R301.2.2 (Seismic requirements) into the beginning of Section R602.10, the code clarifies the application of wall bracing provisions for 1-2 family
The code now also specifically allows mixing of methods between stories & from one wall line to the next. Different bracing methods are also permitted within the same wall line in SDCs A, B, & C only.

R602.10.1.2 Length of Wall Bracing Modification:
Lateral bracing requirements related to wind loads & seismic loads have been placed in separate tables. The greater tabular value from the 2 tables based on the building location applies.

The amount of bracing was expressed as a percentage of the braced wall line. The amount of bracing is now expressed as length in feet. After all adjustments are made, the minimum total length of bracing in a braced wall line must be at least 48 in.

Seismic loading is predominantly proportional to the length of the braced wall line, but the wind loading is proportional to the wall line spacing, the height of the walls, and the height of the roof relative to the eaves. Accordingly values in the seismic table are function of braced wall line length, and values in the wind table are a function of braced wall line spacing.

R602.10.1.2 clarifies that for other than angled walls, only wall panels parallel to the braced wall line count in satisfying the amount of bracing requirements.

Where exterior braced wall panels are subjected to wind uplift, connections must be provided unless the weight of the wall above offsets the wind uplift forces. When the net uplift at the bottom of wall exceeds 100 plf, connections such as straps must be provided from story-to-story to provide a complete load path from the roof to the foundation.

Walls perpendicular to the braced wall line do not count toward the bracing amount required in the direction of the braced wall panels that are subjected to wind uplift. Values in the wind table are based on an assumed 10 ft. high wall for each story & 10 ft. height between the eave & ridge of the roof.

A footnote to the wind bracing table permits the required bracing length for methods other than let-in-bracing in 1 story or the top story of 2 or 3 story buildings to be reduced when tie down devices are provided at braced wall panels.

R602.10.13 Angled Corners of Braced Wall Lines Addition:
This new section allows angled wall segments to contribute to the amount of wall bracing in a braced wall line.

This change permits angled walls up to 8ft. long & no more than 45 degrees out of plane of the braced wall line to be included in the amount of required bracing.

R602.10.1.4 Braced Wall Panel Location Modification:
The location requirements for braced wall construction are now grouped together in a

The 2006 IRC permitted a maximum inset distance to 12.5 ft. from both ends of a braced wall line, provided the amount of bracing satisfied the percentage

The 2009 IRC limits the combined total inset distance to 12.5 ft. while still allowing inflexibility to inset a panel a distance of 12.5 ft. from 1 end.

The change is a result of concerns that 1 4ft. braced wall panel installed in the center of a 25ft. long braced wall line would not provide
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>single section &amp; adds several figures.</strong></th>
<th>requirements.</th>
<th>New text clarifies that all of the braced wall panels are allowed to be offset 4 ft. from the line that establishes the braced wall line &amp; the total out-to-out offset of brace wall panels is not more than 8 ft. adequate bracing even if it satisfied the minimum bracing length requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R602.10.1.5 Braced Wall Line Spacing for Seismic Design Categories D0, D1 &amp; D2</strong> Modification: This change expands the exception to permit wall line spacing of 35ft. for buildings in Seismic Design Categories D0, D1 &amp; D2 subject to adjustment factors to provide an amount of bracing adjusted to be equivalent to the 25ft. spacing requirements.</td>
<td><strong>R602.10.11.1</strong> the 2006 IRC permitted an increase to 35ft. braced wall line spacing for only 1 large room not exceeding 900 sq. ft.</td>
<td><strong>R602.10.1.5 replaces &amp; modifies the 2006 R602.10.11.1.</strong> The new exception allows spacing up to 35ft. throughout the building by increasing the amount of braced wall panels in the braced wall line. This exception also places limits on length-to-width ratio for the roof and floor diaphragms to ensure lateral loads are adequately transferred to the braced wall lines &amp; increases the fastening for top plate splices to account for the increased span of the diaphragm. The change does not reduce the seismic resistance but allows the same building plans to be used in Seismic Design Categories D0, D1 &amp; D2 as are used in Seismic Design Category C when the appropriate bracing adjustments are applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R602.10.2 Intermittent Brace Wall Panel Construction Methods Modification:</strong> The bracing methods of the 2006 IRC listed as types 1-8 &amp; the 2 alternate braced wall panel methods have been grouped into 1 table &amp; given a 2-3 letter abbreviation to make the section more user friendly.</td>
<td><strong>R602.10.2.1</strong> the construction of intermittent braced wall panels shall be in accordance with 1 of the methods listed in Table 602.10.2</td>
<td><strong>The code now uses the term ‘intermittent’ to describe bracing methods utilizing isolated braced wall panels &amp; to clearly differentiate these methods from continuous sheathing methods. The intermittent bracing methods are now placed in tabular format with a description, illustrative icon &amp; connection criteria.</strong> The new tabular format is intended to make it easier for code users to understand the options available. The reorganization &amp; labeling intend to clarify the prescriptive bracing provisions &amp; the 2 distinct paths for compliance – intermittent &amp; continuous methods – to promote more consistent application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R602.10.2.1 intermittent **braced wall panels** shall have gypsum wall board installed on the side of the wall opposite the bracing material. Gypsum wall board shall be not less than \( \frac{1}{2} \) in. in thickness & be fastened in accordance with Table R702.3.5 for interior gypsum wall board. Exceptions:
1. Wall panels that are braced in accordance with methods GB, ABW, PFG & PFH.
2. When an **approved** interior finish material with an in-plane shear resistance equivalent to gypsum board is installed.
3. For methods DWB, WSP, SFB, PBS, PCP & HPS, omitting gypsum wall board is permitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R602.10.3 Minimum Length of Brace Wall Panels Modification:</th>
<th>provided the length of bracing in Tables R602.10.1.2(1) &amp; R602.10.1.2(2) is multiplied by a factor of 1.5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The code now recognizes braced wall panels less than 48 in. but not less than 36in. in length in Seismic Design Categories A,B &amp; C.</td>
<td>The prohibition of adhesive attachment of wall sheathing in Seismic Design Categories C, D0, D1 &amp; D2 is relocated from Section 602.10.11.5 of the 2006 IRC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R602.10.3.2 Method ABW – Alternate Braced Wall Panels Modification:</th>
<th>R602.10.4 was inconsistent in terminology, expressing such braced wall panel measurements as width, length or percentage of the braced wall line.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new figure replaces much of the text in this section to more clearly illustrate the construction details for alternate braced wall panels, now described as bracing method ABW.</td>
<td>R602.10.3 replaces &amp; modifies the 2006 R602.10.4. The amount of bracing is now expressed as the minimum total length of braced wall panels measured in the direction of the braced wall line. In most cases, the length of the braced wall panel in the 2009 IRC is equal to the actual length of the braced wall panel in the horizontal direction, provided it is not less than 48 in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R602.10.3.3 Method PFH – Portal Frame with Holds-Down Modification:</th>
<th>For intermittent braced wall panels using methods other than in-bracing &amp; gypsum board, the code now recognizes that panels less than 48in. in length contribute to the bracing of buildings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The alternate bracing method for a braced wall panel adjacent to a door or window opening, typically used at large overhead garage door openings, is now known as portal frame with holds-down (Method PFH).</td>
<td>For braced wall panels not less than 36in. in length in Seismic Design Categories A, B &amp; C, the new partial credit allowance maintains the bracing strength requirements while providing some flexibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R602.10.3.3 Method PFH – Portal Frame with Holds-Down Modification:</th>
<th>There is no partial credit for panels less than 48in. in length on 10ft. high walls or panels less than 42in. in length on 9ft. high walls.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As with alternate braced wall panels (ABW), bracing method PFH provides equivalent strength to standard 48in. braced wall panel through very specific reinforcing &amp; connection details. The lengthy text describing those details was viewed as cumbersome &amp; confusing and has been deleted in favor of the line drawing illustration.</td>
<td>Alternate braced wall panel construction (ABW), is 1 of the more complicated provisions in the wall bracing section. Other editorial changes to this section reflect the preferred terminology in an effort to provide accuracy &amp; consistency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R602.10.3.3 Method PFH – Portal Frame with Holds-Down Modification:</th>
<th>As with alternate braced wall panels (ABW), bracing method PFH provides equivalent strength to standard 48in. braced wall panel through very specific reinforcing &amp; connection details. The lengthy text describing those details was viewed as cumbersome &amp; confusing and has been deleted in favor of the line drawing illustration.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R602.10.3.3 Method PFH – Portal Frame with Holds-Down Modification:</th>
<th>As with alternate braced wall panels (ABW), bracing method PFH provides equivalent strength to standard 48in. braced wall panel through very specific reinforcing &amp; connection details. The lengthy text describing those details was viewed as cumbersome &amp; confusing and has been deleted in favor of the line drawing illustration.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**R602.10.4 Continuous Sheathing Modification:**
The code now recognizes the practice of mixing intermittent bracing methods with the continuous sheathing method. The continuous sheathing method of bracing has undergone extensive revision & expansion to provide more flexibility in the design of & construction of dwellings.

**R602.10.5 Length Requirements for Braced Wall Panels in a continuously sheathed wall did not clearly explain that continuous sheathing was a separate path from isolated wood structural panels for compliance with bracing provisions.**

Table R602.10.5 computed the panel length required based on the height of the adjacent door or window & the applicable maximum height to length aspect ratio.

**R602.10.4 replaces & modified the 2006 R602.10.5.**

In an effort to clearly differentiate intermittent from continuous bracing methods, the continuous sheathing provisions are no longer tied to wood structural panel bracing method WSP (formerly method 3).

Table R602.10.5 has been deleted & the minimum total length of braced wall panels for continuous sheathing appears in the applicable column of either Table R602.10.1.2(1), when wind controls, or Table R602.10.1.2(2), when seismic controls. The tabular value is no longer based on adjacent opening heights expressed as a percentage of wall heights.

Amounts of required bracing are expressed as the length of braced wall panels in feet rather than a percentage of the braced wall line.

The expanded Section R602.10.4 established 3 separate & distinct methods for bracing with continuous sheathing & assigns to the table for intermittent sheathing methods. The alternates for wood structural panel adjacent to garage openings (CS-G) & continuous portal frame (CS-PF) were developed from the footnotes that appeared in the 2006 IRC Table R602.10.5.

Section 602.10.4 requires continuous wood structural panel sheathing on all sheathable surfaces on 1 side of braced wall lines of exterior walls. This change permits other bracing methods to be used at other braced wall lines at any story.

The code clarifies the requirements for a minimum 24
R602.10.6 & R602.10.7 Braced Wall Panel Connections & Support Modification:

Requirements for braced wall panel connection to wood framing have been revised & the code now recognizes masonry stem wall construction for supporting braced wall panels & prescribes reinforcing when those walls are 48 in. or less in length.

Masonry stem walls were not addressed in relation to bracing in previous editions of the IRC. In particular, the absence of language addressing portal frame panels supported masonry stem walls, as sometime occur at garage doors & slab on grade conditions, has resulted in inconsistent application of the code.

R602.10.6 Braced wall panels shall be connected to floor framing or foundations as follows:

1. Where joists are perpendicular to a braced wall panel above or below, a rim joist, band joist or blocking shall be provided along the entire length of the braced wall panel in accordance with Figure R602.10.6(1). Fastening of top & bottom wall plates to framing, rim joist, band joist and/or blocking shall be in accordance with Table R602.3(1). Fastening of blocking & wall plates shall be in accordance with Table R602.3(1) & Figure R602.10.6(2).

2. Where joists are parallel to a braced wall panel above or below, a rim joist, end joist or other parallel framing member shall be provided directly above & below the braced wall panel in accordance with Figure R602.10.6(2). Where a parallel framing member cannot be located directly above & below the panel, full-depth blocking at 16 in. spacing shall be provided between the parallel framing members to each side of the braced wall panel in accordance with Figure R602.10.6(2). Fastening of blocking & wall plates shall be in accordance with Table R602.3(1) & Figure R602.10.6(2).

3. Connections of braced wall panels to concrete or masonry shall be in accordance with Section R403.1.6.

R602.10.7 Braced wall panel support shall be provided as follows:

1. Cantilevered floor joists, supporting braced wall lines, shall comply with Section R502.3.3. Solid blocking shall be provided at the nearest bearing wall location. In Seismic Design...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R602.10.7</td>
<td>Vertical joints of panel sheathing shall occur over and be fastened to common studs. Horizontal joints in braced wall panels shall occur over and be fastened to common blocking of a minimum 1/2 in. thickness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R602.10.8</td>
<td>Replaces &amp; modifies the 2006 R602.10.7. Blocking is now required for the horizontal joints of braced wall panels sheathing in all Seismic Design Categories. This change also clarifies that blocking is required only for the prescribed braced wall panels, not the entire braced wall line. Blocking at horizontal joints shall not be required in wall segments that are not counted as braced wall panels. Where the bracing length provided is at least twice the minimum length required by Tables R602.10.1.2(1) &amp; R602.10.1.2(2) blocking at horizontal joints shall not be required in braced wall panels constructed using Methods WSP, SFB, GB, PBS or HPS. Gypsum board braced wall panels (Method GB) applied horizontally do not require attachment to horizontal blocking at the joints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R602.10.9</td>
<td>Replaces &amp; modifies the 2006 R602.10.2. Table R602.10.1 has been replaced by separate Tables R602.10.1.2(1) &amp; R602.10.1.2(2) Table R602.10.1.2(1) has been replaced by separate Tables R602.10.1.2(1) &amp; R602.10.1.2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602.10. Required bracing is now measured as length in feet rather than a percentage of the braced wall line &amp; is determined from the wind or seismic table, whichever is greater value.</td>
<td>for determining the total length of bracing to resist the predominant loads from either wind or seismic forces. The 8 types of bracing using isolated braced wall panels &amp; previously represented by numbers are now known as intermittent bracing methods &amp; have been relabeled with short abbreviations. Method WSP now represents wood structural panel bracing replacing the method 3 designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R602.11 Wall Anchoring Clarification: Braced wall panel connections to wood framing at interior &amp; exterior wall locations have been consolidated in the appropriate connections provisions in Section 602.10.6.</td>
<td>Section R 602.11, Wall Anchorage, consolidates requirements for anchoring the sill plate of the braced wall line to a concrete or masonry foundation. Reorganization of this section clarifies that Section R403.1.6 applies to the sill anchorage of braced wall lines for all buildings in Seismic Design Categories (SDC’s) A &amp; B, and for 1-2 family dwellings in SDC C. The anchorage provisions of Section 602.11.1 apply to all buildings in SDCs D0, D1 &amp; D2 and townhouses in SDC C. The stepped foundation provisions related to wall bracing do not apply to buildings sited in SDC A, B, or C. The code no longer differentiates interior from exterior braced wall panels or braced wall lines. Changes in this section are consistent with the effort to place seismic provisions in the section where they are applicable to make bracing provisions more user friendly and eliminate the need to thumb back &amp; forth throughout the code to locate requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R603.1</td>
<td>General elements shall be straight &amp; free of any defects that would significantly affect structural performance. Cold-formed steel wall framing members shall comply with the requirements of this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2009 IRC</td>
<td>expand the scope of the prescriptive methods to include 3 story buildings, an increase from the previous limitations of 2 stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many new figure have been added to the code to clarify the application of the cold-formed steel framing provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R603.2</td>
<td>Table R603.2(2) reflects current industry standardized thickness for structural members expressed as base steel thickness in mils. Reference Gage Number is no longer used in referencing structural members &amp; has been removed from the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R603.3 &amp; R603.4</td>
<td>The 2006 IRC prescribed solid masonry units for corbelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2009 IRC</td>
<td>change recognizes that corbelled masonry units filled with mortar or grout act the same as solid units in supporting the construction above &amp; distribute the load as effectively as solid masonry units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid masonry units are not always available, whereas units filled solid with mortar or grout can be readily made on the job site as they are needed, providing more flexibility to the builder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R606.12.2.1 &amp; Table R606.12.2.1</td>
<td>The 2006 IRC did not address minimum lengths of masonry walls to resist lateral loads parallel to the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section R606.12.2.1 &amp; Table R606.12.2.1</td>
<td>add prescriptive masonry wall bracing requirements for high Seismic Design Categories (SDCs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new provisions apply to above grade masonry wall construction for townhouses located in Seismic Design Category (SDC) C &amp; all building sites in SDC D0, D1, or D2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The minimum solid wall length along exterior masonry wall lines was developed in part to correlate to the minimum length requirements for insulated concrete form (ICF) walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R611.1</td>
<td>The 2006 IRC Section R612 referenced the design &amp; construction requirements of Section R611 for flat insulated concrete form (ICF) walls or ACI 318 with regard to above ground concrete wall provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2009 IRC</td>
<td>merges &amp; correlated the conventionally formed concrete wall provisions with those of the ICF walls in the substantially revised provisions of Section R611.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Prescriptive Design of Exterior Concrete Walls for 1-2 Family Dwellings. Conventionally formed above ground concrete wall provisions have been integrated with the insulated concrete form (ICF) wall requirements.</td>
<td>The applicability limits of Section 611 are generally consistent with the limitations of PCA 100 for building plan dimensions, height, projections, and dead loads. Section R611 is limited to detached 1-2 family dwellings &amp; townhouses located in SDC A or B, and detached 1-2 family dwellings in SDC C. The limited provisions for concrete walls of buildings in high seismic areas that appeared in the 2006 IRC have been deleted but still appear in PCA 100. Townhouses in SDC C &amp; all buildings in SDC D must now meet the requirements of PCA 100 or be designed in accordance with ACI 318. Revised figures &amp; tables for constructing flat, waffle-grid &amp; screen-grid ICF wall systems appear in Section R611.5. Additional provisions are included for constructing these concrete walls based on concrete, aggregate, and steel reinforcement materials used. New provisions govern the location, cover &amp; continuity of the reinforcement &amp; installation of construction joints. The prescriptive technical provisions for exterior concrete walls in R611.6 through R611.8 have been replaced entirely &amp; reflect changes made to ACI 318 &amp; ASCE 7. The new provisions cover horizontal &amp; vertical reinforcement, reinforcement &amp; shear wall (solid wall) requirements around openings &amp; lintels over openings. Section R611.9 has also been replaced with the revised details for connecting wood &amp; cold formed steel framing assemblies to exterior concrete walls. The IRC no longer includes prescriptive provisions for above ground concrete walls in high Seismic Design Categories (SDCs). Section R612 has been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R612.2 Window Sills</td>
<td>The 2006 IRC required a 24 in. minimum window sill height when the opening is more than 72 in. above grade &amp; referenced the ASTM F 2006 Standard Safety Specification for Window Fall Prevention Devices for Non-Emergency Escape &amp; Release Mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification: Changes to Sections R612.2 through R612.4 clarify the child fall prevention alternatives to the minimum window sill height. In the 1st alternative, window fall prevention device replaces the term ‘guard’ as the barrier installed at operable windows with sills below 24 in. In the 2nd option, the code details the performance criteria for opening limiting devices, including provisions for emergency escape &amp; rescue opening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R613 Structural Insulated Wall Panel Construction Addition: Prescriptive provisions for structural insulated panel (SIP) wall construction have been added to the code in a new Section R613.</td>
<td>The 2009 IRC includes prescriptive provisions recognizing structural insulated panels (SIPs) for exterior &amp; Interior wall bearing construction. Similar to the prescriptive provisions for cold-formed steel framing, SIP wall construction in accordance with R613 is limited to 1-2 story buildings not greater than 40 ft. wide by 60 ft. long with 10ft. wall heights &amp; sited in Seismic Design Categories A, B &amp; C. Maximum design wind speed is 130 mph in Exposure C &amp; maximum snow load is 70 psf. R613 contains prescriptive tables, materials specifications, bracing information &amp; construction details similar to those found in the wood &amp; cold formed steel framing &amp; concrete wall sections of the code. The minimum thickness of SIP for a particular application is determined in accordance with Tables R613.5(1) &amp; R613.5(2) based on building width, design wind speed, snow load &amp; elements being supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R703 &amp; Table R703.4 Modification: Performance requirements for wind resistance have been added to the water resistance provisions of exterior wall covering systems in Section R703.1. Changes to Table R703.4 clarify the water resistive barrier requirements for various wall covering &amp; cladding systems &amp; update the fastening requirements to reflect current industry practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R703.1 General - exterior walls shall provide the building with a weather-resistant exterior wall envelope. The exterior wall envelope shall include flashing as described in Section R703.8. The exterior wall envelope shall be designed &amp; constructed in a manner that prevents the accumulation of water within the wall assembly by providing a water-resistant barrier behind the exterior veneer as required by Section R703.2. and a means of draining water that enters the assembly to the exterior. Protection against condensation in the exterior wall assembly shall be provided in accordance with Chapter 11 of this code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provisions for weather resistance in Section R703.1 have been broken into 2 subsections to recognize both water &amp; wind resistance for exterior wall covering systems. The water resistance requirements in this section remain unchanged. Section R703.1.2 provides a testing &amp; analysis of wind pressure resistance of all exterior covering systems, and references the component &amp; cladding wind load requirements of Table R301.2(2) &amp; R301.2(3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change to Section R703.3.2 requires lap siding to be installed as recommended by the manufacturer. The omission of a water resistive barrier behind masonry veneer with a 1in. air space is no longer permitted by Table R703.4. The line item for ‘stone veneer’ has been deleted, the row for brick &amp; masonry veneer has been changed to ‘anchored veneer.’ Anchored veneer now includes brick, concrete, masonry &amp; stone that is secured to the structure with the code prescribed metal ties. Other changes included fastening requirements for wood structural panel siding &amp; vinyl siding to recognize current industry &amp; manufacturer’s recommendations &amp; rest reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R703.7.3 Lintels Modification: Steel lintels supporting masonry veneer above openings now require a shop coat of rust-inhibitive primer or other protection against corrosion. The 2009 IRC also provides an alternative prescriptive method for supporting veneer above measuring up to 18ft. 3 in. in length using a combination of a steel angle &amp; masonry with horizontal reinforcing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R703.7.3 Lintels.Masonry - veneer shall not support any vertical load other than the dead load of the veneer above. Veneer above openings shall be supported on lintels of noncombustible materials &amp; the allowable span shall not exceed the value set forth in Table R703.7.3. The lintels shall have a length of bearing not less than 4 in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section R703.7.3 now specifically requires corrosion resistance for steel lintels to inhibit the development of rust &amp; protect the integrity of the masonry veneer. R703.7.3.1 The allowable span shall not exceed the values set forth in Table R703.7.3.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new section R703.7.3.2 provides a cost effective alternative to the existing steel lintel table for spanning large masonry veneer openings such as occur at overhead garage doors. These prescriptive provisions combine a steel angle with masonry veneer &amp; reinforcing above to form the noncombustible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R703.7.4 Masonry Veneer Anchorage Modification:</td>
<td>The code now prescribes the minimum embedment &amp; cover dimensions for metal wall ties in the mortar of masonry veneer. The 2006 IRC specified the type, size &amp; spacing of the ties but lacked guidance on the embedment details. The new text completes the necessary prescriptive requirements for anchorage of masonry veneer &amp; provides consistency with ACI 530.1/ASCE 6/TMS 602 Specification for Masonry Structures (MSJC Specification). The code now prescribes a minimum embedment of 1 1/2 in. into the mortar or grout with not less than 5/8 in. cover on the face side of the veneer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R703.11.1.1 &amp; R703.11.2 Vinyl Siding Addition:</td>
<td>The 2009 IRC specifically requires vinyl soffit to be fastened in place in accordance with industry standards to ensure adequate wind resistance. New provisions address installations of vinyl siding over foam plastic sheathing based on design wind speed &amp; wind exposure category. Section R703.11.1 requires vinyl siding, soffit &amp; accessories to be installed with the manufacturer's installation instructions, requirements that have not changed in the 2009 IRC. To provide more guidance to the installer &amp; code user, the IRC now specifies that vinyl soffit must be attached to suitable backing or nailing strips. Section R703.11.1.2 has been added to improve wind resistance performance for vinyl siding applies over foam plastic sheathing, a common installation for meeting energy efficient requirements. The code now offers prescriptive fastening requirements for areas with a basic wind speed not greater than 90 mph &amp; a wind Exposure B condition. For basic wind speeds greater than 90 mph or locations in Exposure Category C or D, the design wind pressure rating of the exterior wall covering assembly is determined by applying a prescribed adjustment factor to a base value in the vinyl siding manufacturer's product specifications. The higher adjustment factor is based on wall assembly with gypsum board applied to the interior of the wall. The adjusted design pressure rating for the wall assembly must satisfy the component &amp; cladding requirements of Tables R301.2(2) &amp; R301.2(3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R804 Cold Framed Steel Roof Framing Modification:</td>
<td>Section 804 has been extensively revised &amp; reorganized to clarify &amp; update the prescriptive provisions for cold-formed steel light frame roof construction. Applicability of the prescriptive methods has expanded to include 3 story buildings from 2 story. R804.1 – elements shall be straight &amp; free of any defects that would significantly affect their structural performance. Cold-formed steel roof framing members shall comply with the requirements of this section. All requirements concerning web holes &amp; web hole adjustments are now consolidated in 1 location. The code user now has the choice to reinforce nonconforming holes, patch nonconforming holes, or design nonconforming holes in accordance with accepted engineering practice. In place of uncoated steel thickness, the code now uses the current industry standardized thickness for structural members expressed as base steel thickness in thousandths of an inch. The changes reflect the provisions in the new referenced standard AISI S230, Standard for Cold-Formed Steel Framing – Prescriptive Method for 1-2 Family Dwellings 2007 edition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inch. Reference Gage No. is no longer used in referencing structural members & has been removed from the associated tables.

The in-line framing tolerance in Section R804.1.2 has been revised to account for the special case of the bearing stiffener located on the back side of the joist.

Section R804.3.1, Ceiling Joists, has been modified to include the latest provisions from AISI S230-07 & to improve the understanding of the application. Minimum ceiling joist size, ceiling joist bearing stiffeners, ceiling joist bottom flange bracing & ceiling joist splicing have been relocated into individual subsections to clarify the different requirements.

In similar fashion R804.3.2, Roof Rafters, places information for rafter size, rafter support brace, rafter splice, rafter to ceiling joist & ridge member connection, & rafter bottom flange bracing into separate subsections.

Figure R804.3.2.1.2 has been added to clarify the new subsections on eave overhangs & rake overhangs.

The extensive changes to Section R804 also include new tables on roof rafter spans & for framing members & fastening requirements.

Wind exposure Category A has been deleted from the cold-formed steel provisions because it no longer exists is ASCE 7-05.

**R806 Attic Ventilation Modification:**

The attic ventilation requirements now permit methods & materials other than wire mesh for protecting openings against the entry of insects.

The 2006 IRC required metal wire mesh to prevent insects from entering the ventilated area.

The 2006 IRC required metal wire mesh to prevent insects from entering the ventilated area.

The minimum opening dimension has been reduced from 1/8 in. to 1/16 in.

Vapor retarders are broken into 3 classes based on properties associated with the rate of restricting the passage of water.

The provisions for unvented attic spaces have been rewritten for accuracy & clarification.

The change recognizes that modern manufacturing techniques produce products with punched, slotted, or hidden ventilation openings that do not require traditional insect screening.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R807.1</td>
<td>Clarification: Section R807.1 now prescribes the methods to measure the height of attics requiring access &amp; the height above the attic access opening. The new text clarifies that measurements are taken from the framing members &amp; not from the insulation. In determining attic height, the measurement is taken from the top of the ceiling joist or truss bottom chord to the bottom of the rafter or truss top chord. Conversely, the minimum clearance height above the attic access opening is measured from the bottom of the ceiling joist or truss bottom chord. The other change to this section clarifies that access openings through a wall require a minimum height of 30 in. The intent of this change is to resolve some confusion regarding the methods for measuring heights of attics &amp; the required height above attic access, and to promote uniform application of the provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R905.2</td>
<td>Modification: The changes to the asphalt shingle provisions clarify the attachment &amp; wind resistance requirements &amp; correlate to the applicable ASTM standards. New tables provide asphalt shingle classifications based on design wind speed &amp; whether the shingles are sealed in accordance with ASTM D 7158 or unsealed in accordance with ASTM D 3161. The valley lining provisions have been revised to reference the appropriate standard for the use of self adhering polymer modified bitumen underlayment in a closed valley application. The code now prescribes the minimum dimensions for step flashings. Editorial changes improve the mandatory language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R905.6</td>
<td>Modification: To improve longevity, the minimum spacing between wood shakes has increased to 3/8 in. The 2006 IRC permitted keyway widths as small as 1/8 in. The code now requires the space between adjacent wood shakes or keyway to be not less than 3/8 in. The Cedar Shake &amp; Shingle Bureau brought about this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1001  &amp; R1003</td>
<td>Modification: Masonry fireplaces &amp; chimneys now specifically require protection from parging or clay flue liners able to withstand temperatures of 1800 degrees F. The new text in this section also references the appropriate ASTM standards &amp; intends to preserve the integrity of masonry fireplaces. The references to protecting the cores of corbelled masonry units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The revised definition for masonry chimney clarifies that approved materials include both solid & hollow masonry units be grouted solid. These materials are consistent with those approved for masonry fireplaces in Section R1001.5, Firebox Walls, and R1001.8, Smoke Chamber.

Clay flue liners for masonry chimneys require a non water soluble refractory mortar in accordance with ASTM C 1283 & ASTM C 199.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jan 1, 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**December 2014**

**December 9, 2014**

- 6:00pm City Council Work Session (Library)
- 7:00pm City Council Regular (Library)
- 12:00pm Cordova Center (Library)

**December 10, 2014**

- 6:30pm Planning Commission Regular (Library)
- 7:00pm Harbor Commission Regular (City Hall)
- 7:00pm School Board Regular (High School)
- 12:00pm Cordova Center (Library)

**December 14, 2014**

- 5:00pm Library Board (Library)
- 6:30pm City Council Public Hearing (Library)
- 7:00pm City Council Regular (Library)
- 12:00pm Cordova Center (Library)

**December 21, 2014**

- City Closed - Christmas

**December 25, 2014**

- City Closed - Christmas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jan 1, 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 1, 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 1, 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 1, 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00pm City Council Regular (Library)</td>
<td>12:00pm Cordova Center (Library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:30pm Planning Commission Regular (Library)</td>
<td>7:00pm Harbor Commission Regular (City Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00pm School Board Regular (High School)</td>
<td>12:00pm Cordova Center (Library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00pm City Council Regular (Library)</td>
<td>12:00pm Cordova Center (Library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00pm Cordova Center (Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>