

# Clark County Sustainable Communities

## Stakeholders Meeting #3

November 19, 2009 – 2 to 4:30 p.m.

CTRAN Fisher's Landing Passenger Service Office

Rose Besserman Room, 3510 SE 164th Avenue, Vancouver WA

### Meeting Summary

#### Members in Attendance

Leslie Johnson, Clark County  
Ron Onslow, City of Ridgefield  
Phil Bourquin, City of Camas  
Jim Muir, Clark County  
Webb Wilbanks, City of Battle Ground  
Mitch Kneipp, City of Washougal  
Robert Maul, City of Battle Ground  
Marian Lahav, City of Vancouver  
Mike Piper, City of Vancouver  
Gordy Euler, Clark County  
Mike Bomar, BIA  
Dale Miller, City of La Center

#### Guests in Attendance

Jim Carlson, VECOS  
Mark Basham, Basham Woodworks  
Chuck Dougherty, Synergy Design  
Tony Kantas, Thurston County  
Kei Zushi, City of Woodland

#### Staff in Attendance

Pete DuBois, Clark County  
Gina Franzosa, Cascadia  
Katie Spataro, Cascadia  
Adrienne DeDona, JLA  
Kelly Skelton, JLA

#### Agenda items:

- Welcome, introductions and meeting agenda overview
- Recap meetings 1 & 2
- Review draft Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)
- Review matrix of “menu” items for IGA
- Prioritize Matrix (dot exercise)
- Small group discussion of IGA and process
- Report out
- Full group discussion on next steps and process
- Brainstorm future stakeholder meeting topics

#### Welcome

Gina kicked off the meeting with a round of introductions and review of the agenda.

#### Recap meetings 1 & 2

Gina provided a recap of the previous two meetings for new attendees.

Meeting #1 - Joanne Boys from the City of Washougal shared information regarding Washougal's sustainability efforts. Debbie Cleek from the City of Portland spoke about their building code amendments, and Luke Howard from WSU Extension reviewed the upcoming state energy code amendments on. Mitch Kneipp commented that he was not at the meeting as the summary indicates. This error will be fixed.

Meeting #2 - Included small group discussions about four topics which emerged as recommendations from the SARD study; cottage housing, building codes, minimum parking requirements, and priority permitting, please see the November 5<sup>th</sup> meeting summary to see more detail about the discussions.

Pete introduced Tony Kantas from Thurston County; he is hoping to learn from our efforts and hopefully build off of them and start a similar project in his County. Pete also introduced Kei Zushi from the City of Woodland; Kei commented he thinks this effort has great timing for their community and the level of interest there is in sustainable development.

### **Review Draft Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)**

Everyone received a copy of the draft IGA to review on their own time. Pete commented that right now the IGA is in boilerplate form, we will have a matrix exercise later in the meeting to help further firm up the IGA with tangible action items.

### **Review of Matrix**

Katie reviewed the list of 25 SARD recommendations included in the matrix. She then opened for the floor for comments or questions about the list. The following is a summary of the group's discussion related to the draft matrix:

- On item #2 (Institute Priority/Facilitated Permit Review) Jim Muir commented that there is often a disconnect between development review and the permit review process. Development can take a long time, sometimes requiring public input. Robert Maul commented that the size of the city or jurisdiction will dictate different needs. Ron Onslow commented that smaller cities struggle with these changes if they are not scaled for smaller cities. Pete commented that the IGA could spell out accommodations for smaller jurisdictions.
- There was interest in the creation of a technical advisory committee to review potential sustainable development projects. Katie mentioned that we could have someone from City of Portland's technical advisory committee come and talk about their process of reviewing data and how the recommendations are passed on to building officials.
- Chuck Dougherty mentioned a new nonprofit in SW Washington that is trying to work on education and outreach in the community, especially to builders. This group is currently working on creating a registry of green buildings in SW Washington.
- Mike Piper mentioned the possibility of putting together a building official technical committee to share information. Pete pointed out that this will be part of phase 2 of this project. Webb

said there is already a TAC for building officials in the area they've been operating for about 10 years meeting every month or so.

- Mike Piper said that item #25 (required GHG emission reporting for projects undergoing SEPA review) is going to become a statewide ordinance very soon.

Everyone placed their three dots on the matrix indicating what items are most important to their jurisdiction.

### **Small Group Discussions**

The committee broke up into 3 small groups to discuss the IGA. There were four discussion questions:

1. Does the draft IGA meet the needs of your City/County in supporting sustainable communities? How might it be amended to better address your goals?
2. How would you recommend the Sustainable Communities Matrix be addressed in the IGA (i.e. as a "menu" of action items that jurisdictions choose from)? Are there other action items that you recommend adding to the list?
3. Who in your City/County needs to be involved in the decision making for adopting and signing the IGA?
4. What tools do you need in order to gain support for the IGA?

### **Report Out on Small Group Discussions**

Pete provided the following summary of their small group discussion:

1. Consensus was that, IGA or not, moving forward seemed like a direction people are on board with. There could be possible issues with timing (not a quick turn around), non-binding vs. binding language. The IGA could possibly be taken through a resolution process with each jurisdiction. Robert said different Councils/Boards in different cities are going to have different levels of interest/knowledge and will need to clarify what sustainable development means for their community and if it's necessary.
2. The matrix may not need to be included in the IGA. Certain items could be included that jurisdictions have NOT DONE and that could be done together (i.e. voluntary green building standard, technical advisory committee, etc.).
3. Creating an advisory committee of green building experts was of great interest to the group.

Adrienne provided the following summary of their small group discussion:

1. The group felt that the IGA is too generic and will need to add some of the priorities like a technical resource team, identifying funding for training staff, and resource sharing/staff sharing between jurisdictions (this is especially important for smaller jurisdictions that do not have the staff to do the work).

2. Who is going to be the gatekeeper of the IGA and assure follow through?
3. The Council/Mayor/Board of County Commissioners need to weigh-in. The stakeholders on the committee are not decision-makers. Other jurisdictions like schools, ports, airport, and emergency services should be notified.
4. A concise definition of sustainability is needed. The importance and value of what this would mean - identify benefits and costs for sustainable development. Increased public awareness is needed. Identifying the financial benefits of sustainable development. Showcase projects (case studies). Identify incentives to move forward' though incentives will be different in different communities (i.e. high density development is difficult in small communities).

Katie provided the following summary of their small group discussion:

1. There is some hesitation on an IGA because some feel it may add demand on agency staff for agencies that do not have the resources. It was suggested that a formal commitment would suffice.
2. A voluntary green building standard needs to be clarified by defining how it will be used.
3. It was suggested that this effort dovetail with the building code amendment next July (this is currently being done at the state level and every local jurisdiction will adopt these amendments).
4. To build credibility for the project, a group of specialists could help promote voluntary compliance with the codes.

#### **Group discussion on next steps for future meetings**

Katie asked the group for their input regarding where the project goes from here. She explained that the goal of this project, which is being funded by a grant from the Department of Ecology, is for 50% of the jurisdictions in Clark County to adopt code changes and/or promote incentives to support sustainable communities. One of the outcomes of the project will be the creation of a web-based tool to serve as a resource for local jurisdictions in developing codes, ordinances, policies and incentives that promote sustainable development. The next three meetings, to be scheduled after the first of the year, will focus on this tool and how it should function.

Katie pointed out that a top choice on the dot matrix exercise is the adoption of a voluntary green building standard; 2<sup>nd</sup> most popular is adopt code for small scale energy systems; and 3<sup>rd</sup> is creating an advisory committee of green building experts.

Jim Carlson commented how different the perspective of a builder is from the agency employees. The two builders in attendance both voted for recommendation 10 (allow for "incubator" pilot projects to test green materials) and 14 (develop a neighborhood or district scale renewable energy demonstration project ordinance) and 22 (collaborate in neighborhood scale net zero water pilot project) – none of the jurisdictions voted for any of these three choices. Katie commented that going forward we'll need to include more members of the building community. Jim Muir commented that builders need to make money; sometimes this is an economic issue, not just the government's decision. Mark Basham said that collection of information is important in order to

provide for like minded people to be able to create communities in order to live communally, share resources and work nearby. There needs to be resources in order to fund and develop these types of projects through the County.

Pete added that he felt the project goals needed to be further defined before determining what elements the web-based resource package addressed.

Katie asked the group to vote to decide if we should proceed with IGA. Robert Maul recommended letting people mull things over with their jurisdictions and get back to the project team via email. The group agreed this is the best approach.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.