



CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

**Green Building Task Force
Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Tuesday, August 4, 2020
3:00 – 5:00 PM
Online meeting via Zoom**

The Green Building Task Force (GBTF) will hold this meeting using a virtual, Zoom webinar platform, per Governor Inslee's "Stay Home, Stay Healthy" orders.

Members of the public will be able to call in to the Zoom meeting.
Please click the link below to join the webinar: <https://bainbridgewa.zoom.us/j/96334207203>

Or iPhone one-tap : US: +12532158782,,96334207203# or +16699009128,,96334207203#

Or Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312
626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656

Webinar ID: 963 3420 7203
International numbers available: <https://bainbridgewa.zoom.us/j/96334207203>

AGENDA

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 3:00 PM | Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics) Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest Review & Adoption of Minutes: July 23, 2020 |
| 3:10 PM | Refine Road Map & First Steps |
| 4:40 PM | Assess Feasibility of Completing Phase 1 as Scheduled Discuss Next Steps & Homework |
| 5:00 PM | Adjourn |

**For special accommodations, please contact Planning & Community Development
206-780-3750 or at pcd@bainbridgewa.gov**

**Green Building Task Force
Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interests**

Updated July 2020

*To be read at the beginning of **each** meeting.*

As an initial note for the record, this Green Building Task Force consists of individuals with specific professional expertise in green building programs.

Members of the Task Force have provided, or will soon provide, the City with “Conflict of Interest Statements” that will be available via the Task Force’s webpage.

In the interests of full disclosure and transparency, we will begin this meeting by asking each member of the Task Force to disclose whether they, or a member of their immediate family, have any direct or indirect contractual employment, financial or private interests, or other potential conflicts of interest in, or related to, any of the green building programs or other agenda items scheduled to be discussed at today’s meeting.

[Each Task Force member must verbally state their disclosure(s)]

Having heard the disclosure(s) of your colleagues, are there any objections to the members of the Task Force in attendance proceeding with the agenda for today’s meeting?

[Pause for objections]

[If no objection] Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent all members of the Task Force in attendance will fully participate in today’s agenda.

[If objection, the members should discuss their concerns. Individual members could agree to recuse themselves from discussion of specific agenda items, as may be warranted.] Having discussed the objection(s) raised, all those in favor of proceeding in the manner discussed please signify by saying “aye.” All those opposed?

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Review Minutes – July 7, 2020
OPMA/PRA/Ethics Questions
Prior Public Participation/Feedback & GB Comprehensive Plan
Road Map & First Steps
Next Steps & Homework
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Senior Planner Peter Best called the meeting to order at 3:03 PM. Task Force members in attendance were Jonathan Davis, Kathleen O'Brien, Kathleen Smith, Richard Perlot, and Julie Kriegh. Jason Wilkinson, Russ Hamlet and Marty Sievertson were absent. City Council Liaison Joe Deets was present. City Staff present were Planning Director Heather Wright, Building Inspector Blake Holmes and Administrative Specialist Carla Lundgren who monitored the remote meeting and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed and approved.

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest – Read aloud by Senior Planner Peter Best

Review and Adoption of Minutes – July 7, 2020

**Motion: I so move to approve the minutes.
O'Brien/Davis: Passed Unanimously**

OPMA/PRA/Ethics Questions

None

Prior Public Participation feedback related to GB Comprehensive Plan

Discussion only

Road Map & First Steps

Discussion only

Next Steps & Homework

See slide presentation

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 PM.

7/21/2020 Green Building Task Force Meeting

Ambitious Schedule

- Today:** Preliminary framework for “Road Map” and interim “First Steps”
- 8/4:** Refine ideas for “Road Map” and interim “First Steps”
- 8/18:** Finalize recommendations for “Road Map” and interim “First Steps”

Interim Objective

Recommend an interim “off the shelf” green building program (or components of a program) to be implemented by October [3], 2020 (before the current development moratorium expires) to help with the City’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction goals while a full Bainbridge Island program is developed.

Cannot include: Amendments to Comp Plan or BIMC Title 2, 16, 17, 18
Consider how this interim program will build into a full program.

Plan for Recommending Interim GB Program (7/7/2020)

Draft Next Steps

- Phase 1 Outcome: Interim program or components of a program
 - Immediate first steps (“low hanging fruit” or “bold action”?) in amendment to BIMC 15.04 (Building Code)
 - Road Map for full program (multiple time frames)
 - Near-term (net zero carbon?)
 - Bold quantum leap (negative carbon?)
 - Issues (ideas): public participation (CCAC workshops, other prior public participation, CC public hearing), policy/regulation change of direction (stepping stones/building blocks/road map), applicability to City projects (leadership by example), affordability/equity (tiering)
- Phase 2 Outcome: Near-term program?
- Phase 3 Outcome: Bold quantum leap?

Homework for Next Meeting

- Task Force
 - Review Comp Plan policies
 - Suggestions for interim “immediate first step”
 - Identify existing GB programs/components, model communities, or model codes that you think should be considered by the GBTF
 - Prepare elevator pitch to TF
 - Send staff a few questions/prompts to facilitate conversation for creating a short list of first step candidates
 - Think about what the “road map” to a full GB program should look like
 - Share with staff any prior public participation related to GB you recall
- Staff
 - Summarize existing GB elements in BIMC
 - Comp Plan 20-year demographic forecast for building
 - Inventory of HDDP projects
 - Share Robbie’s contact info for OPMA/PRA/Ethics questions
- Staff/CCAC
 - Are there state law limitations on city’s being more stringent than state code
- CCAC
 - GHG reduction targets related to GB?
 - Public feedback regarding GB

Preliminary “Road Map”

| Phase 1 (Interim by Oct) | Phase 2 (Oct - ?) | Another Phase or Others? |
|--|---|--|
| <p data-bbox="242 321 560 364">Building (Interim)</p> <ul data-bbox="242 392 828 1285" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="242 392 828 771">• Principles (e.g. City of Shoreline)<ul data-bbox="382 442 828 771" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="382 442 649 471">• Lead by example<li data-bbox="382 478 802 506">• Optimize materials/emissions<li data-bbox="382 514 828 606">• Wholistic approach/mutual benefits (people, environment, & economy)<li data-bbox="382 614 828 735">• Future ready (e.g. solar, EV, internet-based system controls/smart grid, battery storage, etc)<li data-bbox="382 742 611 771">• Equity/Justice<li data-bbox="242 792 828 963">• Role of GB in GHG reduction<ul data-bbox="382 842 828 963" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="382 842 802 871">• Conservation/reduce demand<li data-bbox="382 878 789 906">• Solar ready/local production<li data-bbox="382 913 713 963">• Reduce peak demand?<li data-bbox="242 985 828 1285">• Baseline mandatory programs?<ul data-bbox="382 1035 828 1285" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="382 1035 687 1063">• Operational carbon?<li data-bbox="382 1071 828 1135">• Embodied carbon (e.g. concrete – Marin County)?<li data-bbox="382 1142 751 1170">• Covers all building types?<li data-bbox="382 1178 789 1206">• Offer choices (off the shelf)?<li data-bbox="382 1213 828 1285">• All electric (no gas)? – new/remodel? | <p data-bbox="955 307 1337 349">Building (long term)</p> <ul data-bbox="955 385 1465 535" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="955 385 1465 471">• More ambitious programs (incentivized)<li data-bbox="955 492 1337 535">• Embodied carbon? <p data-bbox="955 714 1031 756">Site</p> <ul data-bbox="955 792 1490 835" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="955 792 1490 835">• Incentives (setbacks, etc) <p data-bbox="1312 935 1605 978">Community Solar ?</p> <ul data-bbox="1312 992 1872 1063" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1312 992 1872 1063">• Roofs should be solar ready (roof design, solar access/orientation) <p data-bbox="1312 1128 1541 1170">Microgrid ?</p> | <p data-bbox="1668 292 1987 364">?</p> <p data-bbox="1668 785 1987 871">?</p> <p data-bbox="1668 921 1987 1078">Community Solar ?</p> <ul data-bbox="1312 992 1872 1063" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1312 992 1872 1063">• Roofs should be solar ready (roof design, solar access/orientation) <p data-bbox="1668 1106 1987 1192">Microgrid ?</p> <p data-bbox="1668 1278 2344 1335">Others: High Speed Internet Access</p> |

Preliminary Interim “First Steps”

| Initial Ideas → | Evaluation Criteria/Considerations | → Phase 1 Ideas to Refine |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BuiltGreen King/Snohomish (5-star?) • LEED (non-residential = gold+?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State funding nexus = Silver • Living building challenge (core GB program, net zero?) • Passive house principles • Incentives (expedited permitting, permit fees, performance-based grants, PSE grant for >3-star?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some incentive programs set baseline on existing code • Incentives change/phase out over time • Size & scale • Seattle Code? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing support to keep standards up to date • Benefit more than just buildings • Education & tools to support education, evaluation, and decision making • Barriers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of use; industry learning curve; burden of certification/documentation (should certification be required?) • Performance (when=at least 1 year after occupancy?) • Equity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on affordable housing (size versus certification level) • Applicability thresholds | <p>→ Phase 1 Ideas to Refine</p> |

Plan for Recommending Interim GB Program (7/21/2020)

Next Steps

- Refine ideas for “Road Map” and interim “First Steps”

Homework for Next Meeting

- Julie – Share: DOE study, World Building Council for Sustainable Development framework
- Kathleen O. – BuiltGreen mandatory implementation examples
- Blake – IGBC summary
- Peter – Code collaborative model codes
- TF Members
 - Review materials from the above homework
 - Independently review road map and come to next meeting with your idea of a highly refined version
 - Independently apply review criteria to initial ideas and come to next meeting with refinement ideas

Peter Best

From: Kathleen O'Brien
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 7:09 PM
To: Peter Best
Subject: Expanding on Principles
Attachments: GBTF_LeadingbyExample.docx; GBTF_UsingExistingPrograms&Incentives.docx

Hi Peter:

I promised to find out whether BG certification has ever been required by a municipality. Short answer, it seems not. However I did have a good conversation with Aaron Adelstein with MBAK+S about the program and how it is being used by some Western Washington municipalities to reach green building goals. This led to finding out how certification is used by some municipalities in their own buildings.

I'm attaching two documents. The first is framed around two principles we have discussed: Use existing programs, and Incentivize Participation. The second is framed around the principle of Leading by Example, another topic which came up last meeting.

I won't pretend these commentaries are exhaustive. In particular, the specifics of any requirements should be the purview of those on the Task Force who are actively involved today in designing and building on Bainbridge Island.

I do think we should solidify the high level principles/goals we are hoping to achieve, and tie each of our suggestions to those principles/goals. I look forward to our next meeting. Kathleen O'Brien

Supporting the Principle: *Lead by Example (City Projects)*
Comments @Kathleen O'Brien

Suggest for Consideration: That the City lead the way by requiring their own projects to be designed and built to meet green building standards. I am suggesting that program options approved for use in certifying City projects minimally include LEED and Living Building. Certification and/or verification should be required. The required level should be identified by those actively involved in design and construction today. (Query: Has COBI applied the International Green Building Code to its own buildings?)

Background: According to the City of Seattle's "Sustainable Buildings and Sites Policy" the following requirements apply to City-owned properties:

- New construction and major renovations 5,000 square feet or greater must meet LEED Gold, as well as key performance requirements for energy and water efficiency, waste diversion and bicycle facilities.
- Tenant Improvements 5,000 square feet or greater, with a scope of work that includes mechanical, electrical and plumbing, must meet LEED Gold, as well as water efficiency and waste diversion requirements.
- Small projects, either new construction, renovations or tenant improvements, are to utilize Capital Green (<http://www.seattle.gov/environment/climate-change/buildings-and-energy/city-facilities/capital-green-toolkit>) a green design and construction evaluation tool in project planning and development.
- All new and existing sites projects shall follow best management practices.

I won't pretend to have done an exhaustive study of smaller Western Washington cities, but the City of Kirkland LEED has certified its Justice Center and Annex Building at its City Hall Complex. The City of Sammamish has a LEED Certified City Hall. The City of Issaquah requires "high performance" building in all municipal buildings.

Supporting Two Principles: *Don't Reinvent the Wheel*; and *Incentivize Participation*.
(Comments Relative to Residential Projects) @ Kathleen O'Brien

Suggest For Consideration: That residential projects (including multi-family, home retrofit, and single-family/townhome construction projects) in the City of BI be required to *meet and certify that they meet* a particular level in an approved program.* (Multiple programs could be approved for this use. The minimum required level in each program should be identified by members of the Task Force actively involved in design and construction projects as both doable *and* meeting *current* climate and other environmental policy goals in the Comprehensive Plan.) An incentivized and more rigorous level in each program could be offered to help us meet anticipated climate and other policy goals as envisioned in City policies. There may be residential projects that receive financial assistance from the City (affordable housing?). Those projects should receive financial supplemental assistance to achieve these goals.

*Approved Programs: Program options approved for residential construction should minimally include Built Green and LEED. There are other programs that might be included in the menu, such as NetZero, and Passive Homes but I believe they would need to be supplemented with other non-energy focused practices (perhaps drawn from the International Green Building Code, already approved by COBI), and so the certification process would be a little less straightforward. Regardless, certification and/or verification should be required.

The requirement could apply to specific areas/zones on the island or to the entire City. The level of required certification could also be different depending on the area/zone, or not.

Background: Per Aaron Adelstein, Director of Programs and Products at MBA King and Snohomish County 7/28/20, Built Green of King and Snohomish County administers the Built Green program throughout the State, including Kitsap County. The program is regularly updated and supported by paid and well-credentialed staff. (The MBAK&S owns the license for Built Green; it offers verifiers that are available and do certify projects on Bainbridge Island.) My understanding is that costs to certify in the Built Green program would compare favorably to most other programs we are discussing.

The City of Seattle includes the Built Green Program (as well as other programs, such as LEED) as an option for projects applying under the City's "Green Building Standard" in exchange for additional height, floor area or density. Other cities do something similar. Incentives offered in these smaller cities have included expedited permitting, increased density, free consultation in the early stages and a single point of contact within the permitting office to steward the project through the process. The City of Shoreline has a deep green incentive program that encourages the use of "deep" green building techniques (such as those included in the Built Green Emerald Certification, the Living Building and Living Community Challenges as well as petals,) and specifically offers "code departures."

In the City of Issaquah, there has been a history of private developments gaining approval by including in their master plan a requirement for participating builders to certify their projects to a particular level of the Built Green program (for example, in the Issaquah Highlands.)

However, we need to keep at top of mind that KHBA's government affairs would have an active interest in any ordinance requiring the use of the Built Green program. The original thrust of the Built Green Program was market-based and voluntary. A requirement that allows builders to choose the certification path from a menu might give KHBA members and policy staff the margin of market-based freedom they seek. I believe, however, they might be more inclined to support a voluntary and incentivized green building requirement. Incentivizing rather than requiring certification has a precedent and might be politically expedient, but may not get us to where we need to get to, *unless* the incentive program is materially substantive, and attractive enough that most projects opt in.

International Green Construction Code 2015

The International Green Construction Code® (IgCC®) is a model code that provides minimum requirements to safeguard the environment, public health, safety and general welfare through the establishment of requirements that are intended to reduce the negative impacts and increase the positive impacts of the built environment on the natural environment and building occupants. The IgCC is compatible with all the other ICC codes that we use in building, land development and rebuilding existing buildings.

Chapters

Subjects and brief description

1. The IgCC establishes the limits of applicability of the code and describes the manner the code is to be applied and enforced. Chapter 1 is divided into two parts: Part 1 – Scope and Application. Part 2 – Administration and Enforcement.
2. Definitions of terms, words, and code text.
3. The jurisdictional requirements contained in these Sections are formatted to afford jurisdictions the flexibility to adapt the code in a manner that is best suited to meet their unique environmental and regional goals and needs. Jurisdictional Requirements. This code also allows ASHRAE 189.1, Standard for the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings, to be used. Similarly, ICC 700 (which is a national level green code) may be applicable to specific types of residential construction in accordance with the decisions made by the jurisdiction in the portions of table found in this section.
4. Is intended to minimize the negative environmental impacts on and protect, restore, enhance the natural features and environmental quality of building sites.
5. Addresses material resource conservation and efficiency by means of provisions related to material selection, recycling, reuse, renewability, toxicity, and durability, including resistance to damage caused by moisture.
6. Energy Conservation, Efficiency and CO₂e Emission Reduction. Chapter 6 is intended to provide flexibility and permit the use of innovative approaches to achieve the effective use of energy. All buildings that consume energy must comply with the requirements of Sections 603 (Energy Metering, Monitoring and Reporting), 611 (Energy Systems Commissioning and Completion) and, where indicated by the jurisdiction could require compliance with Section 604 (Automated Demand Response Infrastructure).
7. Water Resource Conservation, Quality and Efficiency. This chapter provides requirements that are intended to conserve water, protect water quality, and provide for safe water consumption.

8. Is intended to ensure that the building's interior environment is conducive to the health of building occupants.
9. Addresses building commissioning, inspections, operation, and maintenance. It requires commissioning and inspections as specifically listed in Table 902.1. Chapter 9 also requires that construction documents contain information related to building operation and maintenance.
10. Conceptually, the requirements of this chapter of the IgCC are based on the requirements in the International Existing Building Code. These provisions are not retroactive. They apply only where buildings are altered or added to.
11. While Chapter 10 is applicable to existing buildings, Chapter 11 is applicable to additions to, and to the alteration, repair, maintenance and operation of the sites on which those buildings are located.
12. The code contains numerous references to standards that are used to regulate materials and methods of construction. Chapter 12 contains a comprehensive list of all standards that are referenced in the code.

The City of Bainbridge Island has not adopted the Appendix of this code.

Appendix A Project Electives. Where Appendix A is adopted, it encourages the construction of buildings that are "greener" and "more sustainable" than those that meet only the baseline minimum requirements found in the body of the IgCC.

Appendix B Post-Occupancy Commissioning Reporting. This appendix contains provisions related to commissioning that are required to be complied with after the Certificate of Occupancy is issued. Appendices are not enforceable unless they are specifically adopted.

Website Resources: Green Building in the City of Shoreline

[Climate, Water & Energy Overview](#)

[Deep Green Incentive Program Overview](#)

[Deep Green Incentive Program Background & Analysis](#)

[2019 Sustainable Shoreline Report](#)

[City Hall Overview](#)

[City Hall Self-Guided Tour](#)

Website Resources: King County-Cities Climate Collaborative

[Green Building and Regional Code Collaborative](#)

[Recap of Recent Actions and Interests for 2020](#)

[Case Studies](#)

Website Resource: [King County Sustainable Cities Program](#)

[GreenTools for City Government](#)

[Roadmap to a Green Building Tool \(2-pager\)](#)

[Green Building and Land Use Policies and Regulations](#)

State Building Code Council staff response on 7/28/2020 regarding making green building programs mandatory in BIMC.

It would depend on whether it was a code you were enforcing or just encouraging, and what kind of scope you intend. For anything that impacts the construction of single family, or multifamily of two stories or less with up to four units, Council approval is required before anything can be enforced. The Council consideration of local amendments is subject to WAC 51-04:

Local government residential amendments submitted to the council for approval shall be based on:

- (a) Climatic conditions that are unique to the jurisdiction.
- (b) Geologic or seismic conditions that are unique to the jurisdiction.
- (c) Environmental impacts such as noise, dust, etc., that are unique to the jurisdiction.
- (d) Life, health, or safety conditions that are unique to the local jurisdiction.
- (e) Other special conditions that are unique to the jurisdiction.

There are no local amendments allowed to the state residential energy code.

Outside of residential construction, local governments may amend the codes to be more stringent than the state code. Please note that some of the cited programs are actually less stringent than the state code in some areas and may need to be modified. There are also some requirements in the code that cannot, by statute, be amended. This includes accessibility provisions, ventilation requirements, water conservation measures and some of the fire code provisions. I doubt that most of these would be impacted by a green code, except perhaps for some of the ventilation requirements or water conservation measures.

For the requirements for submittal of residential amendments, see WAC [51-04-030](#) and [-035](#). See also [RCW 19.27](#), especially 040 and 060, and [RCW 19.27A](#), particularly 015.