

**Greater Toledo Pool Recreation District
Board of Directors Regular Meeting
Minutes
March 18, 2026, 5:00 p.m.
Toledo Library Meeting Room
173 NW 7th Street, Toledo, OR 97391**

Directors Present: Roy Kinion, Peter Vince, Rachael Wallace, and Kay Chambers

Directors Excused: Amanda Hockema

Staff Present: Hal Wallace

Community Members: Jim Chambers

Guests: Chris Giggy, Integrity Management Solutions LLC (IMS) GTPRD Project Manager, via Zoom; Tim Gordon, Scott Edwards Architecture (SEA) via Zoom; and Kyle Conner, Structural Engineer, WDY via Zoom.

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order President R. Kinion at 5:05 p.m.

1. Roll Call:

Establish Quorum: A quorum was established.

2. Review of Structural Engineering Report from WDY—K. Conner explained the report to the board, below I have copied the Summary of the findings. The complete report is on file in the GTPRD office.

ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 Seismic Evaluation 174 NW 7th St WDY Project No: 26028 Toledo, Oregon
Page 1 of 11 SUMMARY At your request, WDY, Inc. has completed a gravity framing analysis and an ASCE41-17 Tier 1 Seismic Evaluation of the Toledo Pool building located at 147 NW 7th St in Toledo, Oregon. The intent of this evaluation is to provide a list of deficiencies in the gravity and lateral force resisting system of the structure. ASCE 41-17 Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings is the current code standard in Oregon for evaluating existing buildings. It has evolved from a series of publications originally sponsored by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to encourage local decision makers, design professionals, and building owners, to undertake a program of mitigating the risks posed by existing building hazards in the event of an earthquake. ASCE41-17 has been adopted by the International Building Code (IBC) and the Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC). ASCE41-17 is a multi-tiered evaluation. Tier 1 is a screening procedure where elements of the lateral force resisting system are evaluated for compliance with a series of checklists and a limited set of structural calculations. A building that complies with Tier 1 would be considered compliant with current code provisions for existing buildings. Tier 2 is a deficiency-based evaluation of elements that are found non-compliant in Tier 1. Tier 2 includes a structural analysis of the building to calculate seismic demandcapacity ratios for elements of the seismic force-resisting system. Elements that do not meet Tier 2 requirements are considered deficient and would require retrofit to meet the performance objective. A Tier 2 analysis is not being provided as part of this analysis. This evaluation is based on our review

of available building drawings, observation of exposed to view structural elements, and our experience with similar structures constructed during the same period as that reviewed. The scope of services did not include removal of existing finishes to expose hidden conditions, nor destructive testing to determine existing material strengths. The original building drawings were not reviewed in conjunction. It is believed that the existing structure was constructed in the 1940s. As part of WDY analysis, drawings from a remodel in the 1970s were reviewed as well as a structural review of the building provided by ZCS Engineers in 2014. There have been significant changes to the building code during the last four decades concerning seismic design. The current building code is the 2025 Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC) which is based on the International Building Code (IBC). There have been significant Code changes concerning the types of construction that are allowed, requirements for member design, and detailing requirements for connections since this building was designed. Previous codes often focused solely on strength. Newer requirements are intended to provide members and connections that better dissipate seismic energy before failure, avoid brittle failures, and retain some residual strength and stiffness once the expected capacity has been reached. In the current building code (2025 OSSC) performance levels are addressed by assigning a Risk Category of I through IV. Most commercial buildings are Category II. Schools, public assembly spaces and similar structures are Category III. Essential facilities such as fire & rescue, emergency services and similar are Category IV. Using OSSC Risk Categories, for the Pool building, would be a Risk Category III structure. In ASCE41-17, category III structures are evaluated to the Basic Performance Objective for Existing Buildings (BPOE). ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 Seismic Evaluation 174 NW 7th St WDY Project No: 26028 Toledo, Oregon Page 2 of 11 ASCE41-17 defines Building Performance Levels as follows for structural and nonstructural: Structural Performance Levels Performance Level Structural system post-earthquake S-1 Immediate Occupancy The structure remains safe to occupy and essentially retains its preearthquake strength and stiffness S-2 Enhanced Safety Post earthquake damage state between immediate occupancy and life safety S-3 Life Safety Post earthquake damage state in which the structure has damaged components but retains a margin of safety against partial or total collapse S-4 Reduced Safety/Limited Safety Post earthquake damage state between the life safety structural performance level and collapse prevention structural performance level S-5 Collapse Prevention Post-earthquake damage state in which the structure has damaged components and remains standing but retains no margin of safety against collapse S-6 Structural Performance Not Considered Evaluation or retrofit does not address the structure Nonstructural Performance Levels Performance Level Nonstructural system post-earthquake N-A Operational Nonstructural Nonstructural components are able to provide the functions they provided in the building before the earthquake N-B Position Retention Nonstructural components might be damaged to the extent that they cannot immediately function but are secured in place as that the damaged caused by falling, toppling, or breaking of utility connections is avoided. N-C Life Safety Nonstructural components may be damaged, but the consequential damage does not pose a life safety threat N-D Hazards Reduced Nonstructural components are damaged and could potentially create falling hazards, but high-hazard nonstructural components are secured to prevent falling into areas of public assembly or those falling hazards from this components could pose a risk to life safety for many people N-E Nonstructural Performance Not Considered Evaluation or retrofit does not address all nonstructural components to one of the levels above ASCE 41-17 has two defined performance objectives, basic performance objective for existing

buildings (BPOE) and basic performance objective equivalent to new building standards (BPON). Inside of each performance objective, there are two design force levels to be reviewed. These force levels are summarized in the tables below. Basic Performance Objectives Equivalent to New Buildings Hazard Level Design Force Level BSE-2N Ground shaking based on the Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCER) per ASCE 7 at a site. BSE-1N Taken as two-thirds of BSE-2N at a site ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 Seismic Evaluation 174 NW 7th St WDY Project No: 26028 Toledo, Oregon Page 3 of 11 Basic Performance Objectives for Existing Buildings Hazard Level Design Force Level BSE-1E Seismic hazard with 20% probability of exceedance in 50 years, but not greater than BSE-1N at a site BSE-2E Seismic hazard with 5% probability of exceedance in 50 years, but not greater than BSE-2N at a site It is our understanding that the basis of this report is for voluntary seismic improvements and there are no proposed structural modifications, changes to use, or changes of occupancy. Based on this being a voluntary seismic report and the building risk category of III, WDY reviewed this structure using the BPOE criteria. This is a lower hazard level than would be required for new buildings. Using ASCE 41-17 review criteria for a risk category III structure and BPOE the building will be reviewed to a structural performance level of Limited Safety (S-4). The non-structural performance level reviewed is Position Retention (N-B) As a result of this Tier 1 evaluation several structural deficiencies were identified in the seismic force resisting system of the building. A summary of these is listed below. A full list can be found in Tables 4a & 4b. We recommend a seismic retrofit of elements that do not pass a Tier 2 Evaluation. Summary of ASCE41-17 Tier 1 Structural Seismic Deficiencies and Unknowns: • The structure does not contain a well-defined load path. • The CMU wall connections to the roof diaphragm are noncompliant. • The wood structural diaphragms are noncompliant for continuous cross ties, aspect ratios, span lengths and material type. • Wall foundation dowels are not known. Summary of Gravity Structural Deficiencies based on 2025 OSSC • Primary glue laminated beams (GLBs) across the pool deck are overstressed under dead and snow loading. GLBs are structurally adequate to support the dead load of the roof structure. The GLBs are not adequate to support roof live load (construction) or snow loads. Schematic Upgrade Concept and Additional Investigations To upgrade the CMU wall connection this could entail adding supplementary vertical steel strong backs spaced between the existing wide flange columns and adding connections from the existing CMU wall to the existing columns. On north wall this would require adding new columns. Provide blocking and strapping to the strengthen the roof diaphragm and provide continuous cross ties. Add sheathing over T&G decking in the locker room. Provide out of plane wall ties in the locker room. ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 Seismic Evaluation 174 NW 7th St WDY Project No: 26028 Toledo, Oregon Page 4 of 11 Provide steel framing to structural strengthen existing GLBs. Currently the GLBs remain a voluntary upgrade. As we understand that a re-roof is desired as part of the proposed upgrades to the building. As this is a gravity deficiency, if the re-roof adds weight to the roof from its current weight this upgrade would then be required. Non-Structural Elements ASCE41-17 also includes a Tier 1 checklist procedure for evaluation of non-structural elements in the building that might be a hazard during an earthquake. These can include non-bearing walls, suspended ceilings systems, bracing of fire sprinklers & mechanical & electrical components, and hazardous materials that might be present. The non-structural checklist is included in Appendix B. Further evaluation & retrofit concepts for non-structural elements are beyond the scope of this report. Please contact us with any questions about our findings or recommendations.

3. Discussion on the Engineering Report—K. Conner stated that he found the building to be safe with no immediate remediation needed, he did include suggestions for upgrades in the report. During the report questions were asked concerning the roof and snow loads; the report did not indicate any issues. T. Gordon said the next analysis will indicate what items should be corrected and suggestions of possible upgrades. K. Conner then discussed some corrections that could happen during renovation; reroofing and blocking under the plywood. K. Conner also mentioned that building codes change frequently and the report was based on the upcoming codes that go into effect this year. Another suggestion was to connect the walls to the roof using a more substantial system, he then explained the process. He also mentioned that chlorine is affecting the columns on the pool deck, he stated at curb or flashing would be a fix. The old ventilation systems on the roof were discussed; they will be evaluated in the next phase of the analysis. Some of the suggestions could be done in phases if needed. K. Conner concluded with that considering the age of the building, it is not “too bad”; nothing that requires immediate attention, just voluntary upgrades. A question was asked if there would be any additional testing to be done if the project analysis was to move forward; the answer was no. K. Conner mentioned that if the board had any further questions or concerns after reading the report, they can email him and he would be glad to answer. The Zoom meeting ended at 5:48 p.m.

4. Action Items:

- a. **Vote on Proposal to Approve the Pool Renovation Concept Design from SEA in the Amount of \$69,100:** R. Kinion entertained a motion to approve the proposal from SEA in the amount of \$69,100 as per the current contract with SEA, to move forward the next analysis. R. Wallace moved to approve the next phase of the renovation design; P. Vince seconded; R. Kinion called for the vote by a show of hands; passed unanimously.

5. Comments:

- a. **Public Comments**—None
- b. **Board Comments and Take-Aways**— It was suggested that when the pool contractor comes to do his inspection, to ask if the wall around the pool could be built up to increase the pool depth.

6. Upcoming Meetings:

- a. April 13, 2026, Board of Directors Regular Meeting; 6:00 p.m. in the Toledo Library meeting room.

7. Adjournment—R. Kinion adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Hite
GTPRD Recorder