



REPORT ON WALDRON BROS DRUG BUILDING CONDITION AND OPTIONS

The following report provides updated information on the condition of the Waldron Drug Building, also referred to as The Gitchell. A detailed Structural Evaluation was conducted and a report provided by KPFF in 2009 (Exhibit A). In late 2014 city staff observed further deterioration and requested a site visit from KPFF. In response, KPFF Engineer Stephen Whittington and Architect Peter Meijer of Peter Meijer Architecture, PC (PMA) did a site visit. The result of that site visit was a brief report of findings (Exhibit B).

Structural Evaluations

Original Evaluation

As a result of the 2009 evaluation The City, through the Urban Renewal Agency adopted steps to reinforce the buildings structure and achieve a modest level of preservation. Those steps were reinforcing the North wall and tie-in to the lateral structure; replacement of the roof including parapet. The level of reinforcement was done to meet seismic life safety performance level. In order for the building to be used and occupied further reinforcement was recommended in the 2009 Evaluation (pg. 2-3 Exhibit A). The total cost of that renovation and reinforcement was \$294,000 including the new roof and HVAC system.

The previous work completed in the spring of 2011 did not include the recommended work to make the structure safe for occupancy. Previous estimated by KPFF were at the level completed in 2011 was \$116,000 which did not include the roof or HVAC work (pg. 3 Exhibit A). That portion of the job totaled \$81,582. The remainder of total project cost was due to change orders. That same evaluation had an estimate of \$780,000 to bring the building to "Immediate Occupancy Performance Level." Given the cost increases on projects already completed we estimate bringing the building to that level or restoration would be \$996,000. This does not include any interior remodeling work to make the space usable; it is only for structural improvements.

Site Visit (follow-up evaluation)

In January 2015 Stephen Whittington of KPFF and Peter Meijer of Peter Meijer Architecture, PC (PMA) performed a site visit and subsequently provided a letter detailing their findings (Exhibit B). During this visit much of the basement was flooded. This water may be contributing to the moisture uptake in the sandstone walls noted in both Exhibit A on page 12 of Architect's report and Exhibit B observations #5-#7. Staff believes that the water in the basement is most likely due to river water seepage below grade. This condition will only have occurred after The Bonneville Dam was completed in 1938. The recommendations are to use a sump pump in the basement to reduce the standing water (Exhibit B). This will also add to the current electrical use in the building

which the City currently pays \$3,384 a year on average. The standing water is also likely contributing to higher than expected internal humidity levels. As recommended in Exhibit B, staff determined the drainage of surrounding landscape was draining away from the building with the exclusion of the South side which is in the Rail Road right-of-way.

As noted in the site visit (Exhibit B) staff pointed out a crack running from top to bottom on the East side at the South end of the wall. Staff speculates there are two possible causes for the crack. One possible cause is merely due to drying paint and a crack forming along a mortar line. The other possible cause is the structural stresses induced due to the damage on the NW corner have transferred through the building to increase the stress on the opposite corner. A more in-depth engineering study would be required to determine the exact cause.

Staff Analysis and Recommendations

Analysis

The original evaluation notes that the stone used in construction would not meet masonry standards for use today (Exhibit A pg. 12 PMA). If the crack at the SE corner is stress related, a collapse of the building onto the Rail Road tracks poses a significant risk to rail traffic and the community. Water uptake from the basement contributes to further deterioration of the sandstone walls. The walls at the base will become thin and brittle overtime. The result will be a structural collapse due to the weight load exceeding the walls structural strength at one or multiple points. Placing a sump pump in the basement may extend the life of the building. However, it is reasonable to believe that there is moisture outside the walls in the soil below grade that is also contributing to moisture uptake. In their initial evaluation (Exhibit A) KPFF recommended stripping all paint from the exterior and using a penetrating epoxy to slow the erosion. This method would require a chemical agent to remove the paint. That chemical would then need to be removed by pressurized water which would further damage the exterior walls. Joist bearing ends over the East entry into the building have deteriorated (Exhibit A, plan Sheet S2.0 KPFF). This creates a safety concern for entry into the building. Staff has been instructed to not enter the building unless the joists are reinforced.

To slow the deterioration of the building and make it safe to occupy would take an estimated \$1,000,000. This includes a sump pump installed in the basement and recommendations in the 2009 Evaluation to make the building “Immediate Occupancy Performance Level” compliant. It is further estimated that interior remodeling to make the space usable would take an addition \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000. This includes blocking off the southern portion of the building in the Rail Road safety zone (25 feet from rail center line) for building occupancy (Exhibit A pg. 8 KPFF). The wall would be from the eastern wall to the western wall on every level from the basement to the roof (See Concept Plans, Exhibit A, KPFF). This would reduce the interior length of the building by approximately one-third and total square footage from approximately 4,807 square feet to 2,907 square feet.

Recommendations

1. Contract for demolition of the building (Est. \$35,000)
2. Contract for structural stabilization (Est. \$1,500,000)
3. Postpone further action and continue to monitor.