Historical Preservation Commission Agenda

The regular meeting of the Historical Preservation Commission Committee has been scheduled for November 12, 2024 at 3:30 PM in Community Room, City/County Complex. This meeting will be facilitated by Chair Tom Blurock.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88062710749?pwd=jYvajr9no9BLo4gFw15kYhaGUpsSlL.1

Meeting ID: 880 6271 0749
Passcode: 712104

Phone: 669-900-9128

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
   - **A. APPROVAL OF SEPTEBMER 10, 2024 MINUTES**
3. Public Comments
4. New Business
   - **A. DEMOLITION OF INDUSTRIAL TOWEL & COVER BUILDING (218 S. 2ND STREET) ACTION REQUESTED**
5. Old Business
6. Board Comments
7. Adjournment

File Attachments for Item:

A. APPROVAL OF SEPTEBMER 10, 2024 MINUTES

Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

The monthly meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on September 10, 2024 at 3:30 PM in the Community Room of the City/County Building at 414 E. Callender Street. The meeting was facilitated by Chair Tom Blurock.

1. Call to Order (3:35 pm)

2. Roll Call (0:48 minutes)

In attendance: Chair Tom Blurock, Eli Isaly, Jack Luther, Kristen Vanderland. Planning Staff: Jennifer Severson.

3. Approval of August 13, 2024 Minutes (1:10 minutes)

Luther motioned to approve the August 13 meeting minutes. Isaly seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

4. General Public Comments (2:00 minutes)

No Public Comments.

5. New Business

A. **DESIGN REVIEW – MOUNTAIN ROSE MED SPA – WINDOW DECALS (204 S. MAIN ST) (2:00 minutes)**

The business owner will be putting text and logo decals in the three windows between the Park County senior center and Blend Smoothie. The decal will be white, size 36x36 inches. Brad in Building Department will let you know where to install the address signage. Applicant provided an overview of the services she'll provide and confirmed she will operate out of a business within the Blend Smoothie space.

Vanderland motioned to approve the window decals. Luther seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0. (7:18 minutes)

B. **DESIGN REVIEW – DANFORTH MUSEUM – WINDOWS (106 N. MAIN ST) (9:17 minutes)**

The applicant stated that the glass in the windows and plastic seals surrounding them are in poor condition and continue to deteriorate. One of the upper windows broke recently during high wind and is boarded up as a temporary fix. He would like to replace the upper windows on the second floor now as that is all that is funded at this time. The bottom windows will be replaced when funding is available, likely next

Spring. He would like to get all window replacements approved at this meeting. For upper windows, the top of each window is single fixed pane with double-hung panes beneath. Upper wooden frames will be replaced with fiberglass but frame color will be the same. Severson recommended caution when removing the existing wooden frames in case there is lead in the paint. Luther stated that the decals that are on the windows now need to remain the same once replaced.

Gibson arrived during item discussion- did not vote on application.

Vanderland motioned to approve all of the window replacements for the Danforth Museum. Isaly seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0. (19:18 minutes)

C. **DISCUSS DATE FOR DEDICATION OF SACAJAWEA/MILES PARK NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION PLAQUE (19:50 minutes). No action requested.**

Final Farmers Market is next week so may not be able to organize a dedication of the plaque in time. Severson stated that one day of the Montana Downtown Main Street Conference is being held in Livingston in November. The city is looking at doing two walking tours (art and history tour). Severson stated it would be the perfect time to announce the Historic District Designation for Sacajawea and Miles Park. Luther and other board members supported this idea. Gibson asked for confirmation about where the plaque is located.

4. Old Business (24:57 minutes)

Severson stated that the Hiatt House sign has been restored, and all of the neon is working. The city will not be pursuing any legal action since the issue has been resolved.

Luther asked about the status of the commercial historic surveys downtown. Severson confirmed that the state has not yet assigned site numbers for the surveyed buildings, but they will eventually be entered individually into the National Register.

5. Board Comments (27:00 minutes)

Gibson stated the front of a store on S. Main (200 Block) is being re-stuccoed and they would like to put up a new awning. Severson stated that the particular business is not within the Historic District so they do not need to come through the HPC for approval. The lights will comply with the City's Dark Sky Ordinance.

Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

Blurock met with the project contractor and architects who are just beginning design stage. Severson confirmed the building is within the Downtown Historic District but the lot to the south is not. Blurock shared that the owners of the Industrial Towel property are planning to tear down the historic part of the existing building to build apartment complexes. Gibson asked if the current historic district includes residential structures. Severson wasn't sure how buildings within/ not within the district were determined when the district was mapped. Severson stated that there is no application in front of the board at this time and recommended the board limit discussion about the project until an application is presented.

Blurock and other board members expressed concern over the proposed demolition of the historic brick part of the building and would prefer to see some portion of the existing brick building preserved. Blurock stated that he anticipates this will be an expensive project and salvaging some of the building would likely be a small part of that cost. Board members discussed alternate location of the proposed restaurant and apartments. Gibson made suggestions about parking and vehicular access. Severson cautioned that any discussions by the board are premature and should be limited until an application is presented to the board. Vanderland suggested the discussion be tabled until plans are submitted for HPC review.

6. **Adjournment (4:13 pm)**

File Attachments for Item:

A. DEMOLITION OF INDUSTRIAL TOWEL & COVER BUILDING (218 S. 2ND STREET) ACTION REQUESTED

November 7, 2024

Jennifer Severson
Planning Director
City of Livingston
220 East Park Street
Livingston, Montana 59047

RE: Industrial Towel & Cover Building-

Dear Jennifer:

Things are moving along with Conceptual Design for our new project at 218 South 2nd Street. We will be in the conceptual/feasibility stage of the project through the end of the year and hope to start schematic design/entitlement phase in January 2025. We are moving forward with a plan that represents the highest and best use of the property, the critical components being market rate and affordable housing, associated parking and a small neighborhood restaurant at the corner of 2nd and Clark streets.

Per your request, I am writing this letter to address the historical nature/condition of the existing building and why we are planning its eventual demolition and possible repurpose in order to make way for new multi-family development intended to meet community needs for housing.

OVERVIEW

This document presents observations from the Developer, 45 Architecture & Interiors, and DCI Structural Engineers regarding the existing Industrial Towel & Cover Building (IT&C) and its compatibility with the proposed multifamily housing development. The project aims to establish multiple levels of affordable and market-rate apartments above dedicated parking, alongside a single-story commercial building designated for a neighborhood restaurant at the corner of 2nd and Clark Streets.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The Developer proposes a structure that integrates Type 5 apartments above a Type 1 concrete podium, representing the most effective use of the site for new housing and the necessary parking. The existing IT&C structure and façade are fundamentally incompatible with this envisioned development, primarily due to substantial cost implications detailed in this document.

According to the City Commission Review Draft of the Livingston Downtown Master Plan (August 23, 2024), it is crucial to prioritize sensitive height transitions along Clark Street to safeguard existing single-family homes. Maintaining the IT&C building would force the new

development's mass towards Clark Street, negatively impacting the surrounding residential area and conflicting with established land-use policies. Furthermore, preserving the current structure would divert funds from the housing project; any expenditure on the IT&C façade or structure would diminish the budget available for creating urgently needed affordable and market-rate units. Attempts to salvage the façade alone would also demand considerable resources for structural modifications, rendering this option impractical.

NEW STRUCTURE

To fulfill the development objectives of providing onsite parking and new residential units, the project will extend from lot line to lot line. The new structure will include:

- A Type 1 concrete podium with ground-level parking
- A four-story Type 5 residential building above

EXISTING IT&C BUILDING

The current IT&C building and façade are unsuitable for several reasons:

- **Building Type:** The timber-framed and masonry structure cannot accommodate the planned Type 1/Type 5 construction.
- **Building Deterioration:** The building exhibits visible deterioration in its roof, masonry, timbers, and mechanical systems.
- **Safety and Feasibility:** Retaining the 2nd Street façade would necessitate extensive upgrades to align with current safety and seismic standards, with costs far exceeding potential benefits.
- **Structural Integrity:** The façade requires additional support for stability, rendering its retention both impractical and costly.
- **Construction Challenges:** Preserving the façade during new construction poses various risks and operational difficulties. The rhythm and sequencing of the project would be significantly hindered, leading to increased costs, delays, and extended timelines. Coordinating safe demolition while ensuring structural stability could result in further complications and financial burdens.
- **Unknowns:** Compliance with current seismic codes introduces additional scope and costs.
- **Compatibility with New Design:** The existing façade is misaligned with the proposed floor heights, which may detrimentally affect tenant experiences on 2nd Street and in the podium common area deck.
- **Form and Function:** The existing façade along 2nd Street does not align with the design and program requirements of the proposed new building.

- **Seismic Separation Requirements:** The need for a seismic separation from the adjacent property to the north further complicates the situation, necessitating additional construction costs.

NEW BUILDING FAÇADE ALONG 2ND STREET

The new façade along 2nd Street will showcase a classic thin brick design that pays homage to the architectural and historical character of downtown Livingston. This design will create a harmonious aesthetic that complements the modern structures intended to meet community needs. The new building will be flanked by the historical structure to the north and the new neighborhood restaurant at the corner of 2nd and Clark Streets.

RE-PURPOSING EXISTING BUILDING COMPONENTS

While there are opportunities to repurpose some materials from the existing façade and building, the focus will be on practical and prudent applications, including:

- Utilizing reclaimed bricks for landscaping and distinctive feature walls within the new development.
- Donating surplus bricks to the City of Livingston for appropriate community projects.
- Considering the decorative repurposing of timber framing elements where feasible.

Given these factors, it is clear that preserving the existing building and façade is not viable. The proposed development presents a significant opportunity to enhance the site by creating modern, affordable, and market-rate housing that aligns with the city's growth objectives and Park County's affordable housing needs without the burden of an outdated structure.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns. We will need confirmation and approval of our plan to demolish the existing IT&C building and façade by December 1, so that we can proceed with the design in a logical/practical manner.

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this matter.

Eric Horn- Bridger Residences LLC

Livingston Building Department
Permit Application

Residential ☐ Commercial ☐ Sign ☐ Well ☐ Demolition ■

PROJECT COST: $ 200,000

SITE ADDRESS: 218 S. 2nd Livingston Mt. .....

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Liv. Or.To"S13,to25,Ro9e,Block 94-lots8-12 ZONING: Centeral Buisness district

PROJECT OR BUSINESS NAME: Bridger residence llc .....

APPLICANT'S NAME: Build Group/C&L llc..... PHONE: 406-220-5019

MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. Box 2031 Livingston mt. 59047.....

PROPERTY OWNER: Bridger Residence LLc..... PHONE: 650-619-5339

MAILING ADDRESS: 119 Karst creek Ln Gallatin Gateway Mt. 59730

GENERAL CONTRACTOR: Build Group/ C & L llc PHONE: 650-619-5339

ARCHITECT: 45 Architecture..... PHONE: 406-577-2345

ENGINEER: DCI Engineers..... PHONE: 406-556-8600

PLUMBER: TBD PHONE: _____

ELECTRICIAN: TBD PHONE: _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Demolition and removel of all exsiting structures on site.

All State and City Codes/Permits will be performed as required.

No building or structure shall be erected, moved, added to or structurally altered without a valid permit. This APPLICATION form is to be completed for all development proposals, which need building permits, pursuant to Chapter 6 of Livingston Municipal Code. This APPLICATION form must be completed by the applicant and approved by the appropriate Departments prior to building permit issuance. Applications will not be accepted without a signature. Incorrect information provided in conjunction with this APPLICATION may result in the delay or revocation of building and/or occupancy permits.

SIGNED: _____ DATE: 11/7/2024

Date received: _____ Completion due date: 2025

Resource Technologies, Inc.

1050 East Main Street, Suite 4, Bozeman, Montana 59715
Voice: (406) 585-8005 • Fax: (406) 585-0069 • e-mail: mail@rtimt.com

Via e-mail

January 10, 2024

Mr. Chris Salacinski
shielsvalleyland@gmail.com

Subject: Sub-Slab Soil Vapor Sampling Results;
Industrial Towel and Cover; 208 South 2nd Street; Livingston, Montana

Dear Mr. Salacinski,

At your request, Resource Technologies, Inc. (RTI) is providing additional discussion of sub-slab soil sampling results and clarification as to how those results relate to potential vapor intrusion hazard for building occupants.

With respect to sub-slab soil-vapor sampling results, the Phase II ESA stated:

"Approximately 29 different VOCs were detected in sub-slab soil-vapor samples. Air-petroleum hydrocarbons, including C5-C8 aliphatics, C9-C12 aliphatics, and C11-C22 aromatics were also detected in all three samples. Several reported concentrations exceeded US EPA or Montana DEQ residential indoor-air screening levels in one or more samples including C5-C8 aliphatics; C9-C12 aliphatics; C9-C10 aromatics; 1,3 butadiene; chloroform; benzene; 1,4 dioxane; tetrachloroethene; ethylbenzene; and naphthalene Please note that indoor-air screening levels are not applicable to sub-slab soil vapor, but screening levels are cited to provide perspective on the magnitude of soil vapor sampling results."

First, the rationale for collecting sub-slab soil-vapor samples was to seek indirect evidence of soil impacts beneath the three subsurface vaults that were the main areas of interest addressed by the Phase II ESA. The sub-slab soil-vapor sampling results did indicate the *potential* existence of soil impacts beneath the vaults; however, analytical results of soil samples collected beneath the floor of the vaults indicated that any soil impacts underlying the vaults were minor.

The following statement in the Phase II ESA: *"Please note that indoor-air screening levels are not applicable to sub-slab soil vapor, but screening levels are cited to provide perspective on the magnitude of soil vapor sampling results."* was included to provide a basis for interpreting and contextualizing the soil-vapor sampling results. It is this statement that warrants further discussion and clarification.

With respect to the soil-vapor sampling results, it is our professional opinion that the sampling results are not representative of soil vapor conditions across the entire facility but are only representative of the areas around the vaults. The sample locations immediately beneath the floors of the vaults were intended to yield results that would be representative of "worst-case" soil vapor conditions since any material that escaped the sumps would, presumably, result in maximum soil-vapor concentrations immediately below the sump floors. The results, in no way, suggest that these vapor concentrations are typical of soil vapor concentrations beneath the remainder of the facility, and, RTI speculates, based on professional experience, that, were soil-vapor sampling to be conducted beneath the facility slab at ground level, it is unlikely that vapor concentrations of equal or greater magnitude, compared to results from beneath the vault floors, would be produced. Furthermore, the soil vapor sampling results are representative of a depth of 10 to 12 feet below ground level, not immediately beneath the ground-level slab that constitutes the majority of floor space in the building.

With respect to the EPA and MDEQ screening levels referred to in the report, the screening levels are applicable to air within the breathing space of a building, not soil vapor. At the soil-vapor concentrations reported in sub-slab samples, and given the cavernous interior of the building, the flux of soil vapor through the floor of the building would have to be unrealistically immense in order to produce vapor concentrations in breathable air that would exceed the indoor-air screening levels cited in the report. The walls and floors of the vaults appeared to be structurally sound so any vapor flux across those barriers would, in our opinion, be negligible.

In short, it is RTI's professional opinion that VOC concentrations in soil vapor documented below the vault floors do not constitute a vapor intrusion hazard to occupants of the building.

Let us know if you have questions or if you require further clarification.

Sincerely,

Resource Technologies, Inc.

Joe Laudon
Senior Geologist

Asbestos Inspection Report for

Former Industrial Towel Building
218 South 2nd St.
Livingston, MT
59047

Prepared for

C&L Construction LLC
PO Box 2031
Livingston, MT 59047

Attention:
Chris Salasinski

September 11, 2023

LENAPE CONSULTING, LLC

MTA- 3050 Exp. 11/04/2023

Robert N. Currie
Inspector

Summary

Lenape Consulting, LLC on August 31, 2023 performed an asbestos survey of the former Industrial Towel building located at 218 S 2nd St. Livingston, MT 59047. The building is slated for demolition. The scope of the asbestos inspection was surveying, identifying, assessing the material's condition, and sampling suspected asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and documenting locations of identified asbestos materials that may will be impacted during the demolition.

Asbestos Findings

Materials containing asbestos with analytical results.

Material Code	Material Description	% Asbestos	NESHAP Categories and condition
M1: Roofing Materials	Black Mastic Roof 1 3 Layers of built up roofing – roof 2	7% Chrysotile Asbestos in Black Mastic 2-5% Chrysotile Asbestos in all layers of built up roofing.	Non-friable Non-regulated in present condition –
M3: Drywall Systems	Gypsum board, paper, & joint compound.	2% Chrysotile in joint compound.	SEE DISCUSSION BELOW
M8: Window Glazing	Window Glazing roof dormers	8% Chrysotile Asbestos in glazing	Non-friable non-regulated in present condition.
TANK INSULATION	Fireproofing and Foam insulation	NON-DETECT	NONE

The report below discusses the comprehensive inspection, findings and the materials suspected to contain asbestos. In the appendix are sketches showing the locations of sampled materials and a photo report showing sampled materials with an overview of sampling locations. The photo report is annotated with text that is to be considered as part of the overall report.

Work can proceed inside the building that does not impact load bearing structures or other structural elements of the building. No asbestos containing materials can be impacted as well. Any work that impacts load bearing structures, or the 'building' must have a NESHAP notification sent 10 business days prior to Montana Department of Environmental Quality, Asbestos Control Program.

The asbestos containing materials must be removed prior to demolition by a contractor that is licensed and accredited with the state of Montana DEQ asbestos control program. The MT DEQ web page lists all contractors qualified to perform abatement activities in the state of Montana. Lenape consulting also recommends Absaroka Abatement LLC for smaller jobs and Ingraham Environmental Inc for large scale jobs such as roofs.

1.0 Introduction

Lenape Consulting, LLC on August 31, 2023 performed an asbestos survey of the former Industrial Towel building located at 218 S 2nd St. Livingston, MT 59047. The building is slated for demolition. The scope of the asbestos inspection was surveying, identifying, assessing the material's condition, and sampling suspected asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and documenting locations of identified asbestos materials that may will be impacted during the demolition.

Asbestos Overview

Asbestos is a trade name for a group of fibrous naturally occurring minerals used widely in building materials because of its ability to bind, resist chemicals, insulate, and fireproof. Documented evidence shows that exposure to elevated levels of asbestos fibers causes a variety of diseases including asbestosis, Mesothelioma, and cancer. Consequently, several agencies regulate the application, removal, and disposal of asbestos-containing materials.

One definition for asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM), found in Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations, (40 CFR, Part 763 – Asbestos Model Accreditation Plan and Section 202, Toxic Substance Control Act is as follows:

- Friable asbestos-containing material containing more than one percent asbestos (>1%), which has been applied on ceilings, walls, structural members, piping, duct work, or any other part of a building, which when dry may be crumbled, pulverized, or reduced to powder by hand pressure. The term includes non-friable asbestos-containing materials after it becomes damaged, by any means, such that when dry, it may be crumbled, pulverized, or reduced to powder by hand-pressure.

Another definition, found in Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations, (29 CFR Parts 1910 and 1926) is slightly different as follows:

- Asbestos-containing materials are any material that contains more than one percent asbestos (>1%) and certain high-risk materials, presumed to contain asbestos, as Presumed Asbestos-Containing Materials (PACM). The PACM designation applies to thermal systems insulation sprayed on or toweled on surfacing material and debris where such material is present. The PACM terminology was added to ensure compliance with the hazard communication provisions of the laws and specifically for buildings constructed prior to 1980.

2.0 Inspection Procedures

Asbestos

The asbestos survey was performed using the applicable portions of the currently recognized standard protocol developed for schools under AHERA, as promulgated in Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR), Part 763.86 and as amended in Federal Register. Since the primary concern for this investigation was to identify asbestos hazards in the building prior to demolition, Lenape Consulting, LLC visually inspected all aspects of the building.

Asbestos Inspection and sampling

The Inspection was conducted by our accredited inspector. Suspect ACBM was then grouped into homogeneous materials and sampling plans developed. Components of the inspection included:

- Identification and documentation of homogeneous suspect materials. Areas from which samples were to be obtained were also identified during this task.
- Collection and analysis of bulk samples to confirm whether the suspect materials contain asbestos.
- An assessment of known or assumed ACBM, generally classifying the materials using categories defined in the National Emission Standards of Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) and in the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) legislation.
- Homogeneous suspect ACBM were, for the purposes of this study and as outlined in the AHERA sampling protocol, placed into the following material type categories: thermal system insulation (TSI), surfacing materials, and miscellaneous materials. AHERA sampling protocol specifies sampling procedures for each martial type.
- Suspect materials were 'touched' to determine the condition of ACM and Friability.

Sample locations for this survey were chosen in a non-random fashion, with emphasis placed on obtaining samples of each type of accessible material. Samples were collected by carefully removing small portions of the suspect material in a non-abrasive manner. If possible, samples from existing damaged areas or loose pieces of material were collected. Immediately after collection, samples were placed in pre-labeled plastic containers. Containers with samples were then placed in a large re-sealable plastic bag for transportation to the laboratory.

Laboratory Analysis of Bulk Asbestos Samples

Bulk samples obtained during the inspection were assigned bulk sample numbers and entered on the sample summary/ chain-of-custody forms. The samples were transported to the laboratory by overnight courier under standard chain-of-custody procedures. The analysis was performed by a State of Montana Accredited Laboratory, in accordance with EPA Method PLM600/R-93/116, which employs polarized light microscopic techniques with dispersion staining for identification of mineral forms of asbestos. The quantification of asbestos in the sample is intended to be an estimate only and the limit of detection for this method is approximately 1 % by volume. Montana Department of Environmental Quality, Asbestos Control Program, recently promulgated those materials identified by PLM methods to have < / = 1% asbestos must either be presumed to contain asbestos or retested using a better but more expensive method, EPA Point Count 400. Sample analysis results are presented in Appendix A.

Quality Assurance and Quality Control

Quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) measures adopted by Lenape Consulting involved field and office components. Key parameters are summarized below:

Field QA/QC

- Review inspection forms for completeness
- Check homogeneous materials listing for sufficient number of collected samples
- Look in all areas for Old Beer Cans.

Office QA/QC

- Review Lab results for completeness
- Ensure appropriate cross-referencing of results, forms for given ACBM
- Verify approximate quantities of ACBM where possible.
- Review recorded field comments for meaning, incorporate as necessary into report.

3.0 Findings

Survey results are presented in the following paragraphs. A more extensive summary of analysis is in the Appendix A, this table also lists the location of where the samples were taken. Appendix D contains the actual bulk analysis from the laboratory.

Building Summary:

Lenape Consulting, LLC visually inspected all aspects of the building.

BUILDING OVERVIEW:

There are two buildings joined together. The older building is a brick & mortar structure building built on a Concrete foundation. The second building, 'the garage', is a metal structure with metal roofing.

Roofs: The roof system is wood underlayment, with built up membrane roof. The garage has a metal roof with some black mastic around vent pipes.
Exterior: Brick & Mortar or metal.
Interior: Plaster, CMU, Ceramic Brick, Brick& Mortar, drywall systems for walls and ceilings. Some ceilings have ceiling panels or sound board.
Foundation: Concrete.

Cementitious Materials:

Renewed interpretation and enforcement of the concept that "if it is not steel, wood, or glass it must be sampled," dictates that cementitious materials be sampled. This includes Concrete masonry units (CMU), concrete, brick & mortar, stucco, and grout. All cementitious materials were sampled.

Based on the overall inspection of the building a list of presumed to contain asbestos (PACM) and suspected to contain asbestos was developed from the building components. The suspected materials were sampled in accordance to AHERA sampling protocols.

Table 1
SUMMARY OF MATERIALS SUSPECTED TO CONTAIN ASBESTOS

Material Code	Material Description	# Occurrences	# Samples
F1	Seamless Flooring & Mastic	1	3
F2	Vinyl Tile & Mastic	2	6
M1	Roofing Materials	2	6
M3	Drywall	3	9
M4	Sound Board	1	3
M6	Ceiling Tile	2	6
M7	Plaster/Stucco	2	6
M8	Glazing	1	3
M12	Covebase & mastic	1	3
M16	Cementitious	8	24
T1	Tank insulation	2	6
T10	Foil Face insulation &Mastic	1	3
		TOTAL	**78**

Asbestos Findings

The building had (12) materials suspected to contain asbestos as shown in the table 1 above.

The suspect materials were sampled according to AHERA regulations.

The report below discusses the comprehensive inspection, the findings, and the materials suspected to contain asbestos. The report below also contains a discussion on the materials encountered and assumptions made. Table 2 is a summary of sampled materials that had analytical results with asbestos present.

Table 2
Materials containing asbestos with analytical results.

Material Code	Material Description	% Asbestos	NESHAP Categories and condition
M1: Roofing Materials	Black Mastic Roof 1 3 Layers of built-up roofing – roof 2	**7% Chrysotile Asbestos in Black Mastic** **2-5% Chrysotile Asbestos in all layers of built-up roofing.**	**Non-friable Non-regulated in present condition –** **Removal by a contractor that is licensed and accredited with the state of Montana DEQ asbestos control program**
M3: Drywall Systems	Gypsum board, paper, & joint compound.	**2% Chrysotile in joint compound.**	**Potentially friable and regulated.** **Removal by a contractor that is licensed and accredited with the state of Montana DEQ asbestos control program**
M8: Window Glazing	Window Glazing roof dormers	**8% Chrysotile Asbestos in glazing**	**Non-friable non-regulated in present condition.** **Removal by a contractor that is licensed and accredited with the state of Montana DEQ asbestos control program.**
TANK INSULATION	Fireproofing and Foam insulation	**NON-DETECT**	**NONE**

The flooring & mastic, sound board, ceiling tile, plaster, covebase & mastic, cementitious materials, and insulation had a non-detectable (ND) amount of asbestos.

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusions

The asbestos containing materials in the roofing, drywall system, and window glazing must be removed prior to demolition by a contractor that is licensed and accredited with the state of Montana DEQ asbestos control program. Client should present this report to potential contractors for bids. The contractors will have the best practices available to remove the asbestos in compliance with state and federal regulations.

Work can proceed inside the building that does not impact load bearing structures. Any work that impacts load bearing structures, or the 'building' must have a NESHAP notification sent 10 business days prior to Montana Department of Environmental Quality, Asbestos Control Program.

The MT DEQ web page lists all contractors qualified to perform abatement activities in the state of Montana. Lenape consulting also recommends Absaroka Abatement LLC for smaller jobs and Ingraham Environmental Inc for large scale jobs such as roofs.

5.0 **Limitations**

This asbestos assessment report was prepared based on information obtained during the survey, interpretation of the laboratory results of bulk samples of building materials collected during the survey. The conclusions of this report are professional opinions based solely upon visual site observations and interpretations of laboratory analysis and field data as described in our report.

This report has been prepared to provide information concerning the various types of asbestos-containing materials that may be present within the renovation areas. The inspection of the building still includes only those materials that were visible and accessible at the time of our inspection.

This inspection and report are intended to identify and assess asbestos-containing materials.

Our opinions are intended exclusively for use by Chris Salacinski. The scope of services performed by Lenape Consulting, LLC may not be appropriate to satisfy the needs of other users, and any use or re-use of this document, or the findings presented herein, is at the sole risk of the user.

The Opinions presented herein apply to the site conditions existing at the time of our investigations. Therefore, our opinions and recommendations may not apply to future conditions that may exist at the site, which we have not had the opportunity to evaluate.

6.0 **References**

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants, 40 CFR 61 Subpart M.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA), 40 CFR 763

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)
Construction industry Standard (1994), 29 CFR 1926.1101

State of Montana Asbestos Regulations
ARM 16.42.310-327 and 16.42.401

State of Montana Department of Environmental Quality web site as of January 2021

Demolition Plan for (E) Building at (N) Bridger Residences

Note: the lot is oriented on a street that runs SE to NW. For the purposes of this report, we will refer to the NW direction as “North” and the SE direction as “South” for simplicity.

Existing Conditions

- The southernmost portion of the building appears to be a metal building addition to the original Industrial Towel & Cover (IT&C) Supply building.
    - It is assumed that the roof structure is supported on beams and columns at the exterior rather than bearing walls.
    - At this point, it is unclear if there is double structure at the north interface or if it ties directly into the existing south wall of IT&C.
    - Exterior is standard metal siding.
- The remainder of the building is the existing IT&C building.
    - Our understanding of this building is it is constructed of timber framing with exterior unreinforced brick masonry and hollow clay tile walls.
- At the north end of the property line, the IT&C building wall is tight with another existing building to the northeast of the subject property. This existing building currently functions as an AirBnB and has a basement in its current construction. Protect this building to remain in the final condition.
    - The north wall of the IT&C building extends further west, past the building to the northeast, and is once again exposed on that north side. This exposed wall appears to have previously been an interior masonry wall as evidenced by the joist pockets and use of hollow clay tile. There is also a concrete wall tight to the masonry wall that appears to be leftover from a previous building or addition.
    - Continuing to the west, another existing building ties into the IT&C building. This building appears to be light framed wood construction and consists of garage space with living above. This building is to remain and should be protected during demolition and excavation. It is assumed that this building likely has a standard, shallow, 4-foot frost wall. It also appears

that a positive connection exists at the roofline, with the potential for roof flashing to be continuous. This will need to be removed prior to the removal of the brick wall of the IT&C to ensure the roof is not damaged during demolition.

Demo of Existing Building

- Exterior fencing would need to be constructed on the east side of the building to protect the public during demolition due to the proximity to the public right of way.
- For the southernmost portion, demolition should be fairly straightforward.
    - Care should be taken when impacting the interface with the masonry building to the north as the connection between these buildings is unknown.
    - Demo should begin at the roof, shoring walls and columns as required to ensure their stability after roof removal and before wall removal.
    - Demolition of foundations will be required to provide a clear excavation for the new construction.
- Moving north to the existing IT&C building, protection of the right of way will still need to be provided.
    - Demo should again begin with removal of the existing roof, ensuring control/stability of the existing bearing walls during that process. Temporary bracing of the unreinforced masonry walls will be required.
    - Once the roof has been removed, interior non-bearing walls can be removed, as well as exterior load-bearing walls.
    - Extra care shall be taken at the north interface of the existing IT&C building and the existing historic building to remain. Protect/shore as required to ensure no impacts of this demo process on the existing historic building to remain. During demolition, take care not to add a surcharge to the existing basement walls of this building, shoring or isolating as necessary.
    - If locations are encountered where the existing IT&C building is connected to the existing historic building to remain, contact DCI Engineers for further evaluation prior to demolition.
    - Similarly, demolition of foundations will likely be required to ensure clear excavation for the new construction. In all cases, care should be taken to avoid undermining any existing foundation elements of buildings that are remaining.
    - At the interface with the existing garage building with living above, care should be taken to not undermine the existing foundations during excavation and demolition.