

MINUTES
Green Building Incentive Task Force
March 24, 2011
City Hall, Room 209, 12:00 PM

Introductions

The Task Force took a moment to reintroduce fellow members and others present at the meeting.

1. Review and approve of GBITF minutes from March 24, 2011.

The minutes were summarized by Councilor Marshall. The minutes were unanimously approved by the Committee.

2. Review of Green Building Programs in Boston and San Diego County.

Houseal summarized the memo submitted to the Committee on the survey of Boston's and San Diego County's green building programs.

Boxer asked if Portland has a similar permits and fees format to San Diego? Planning Director Alex Jaegerman stated that there are certain fees for building permits and cost varies by project. The format seems similar or comparable.

3. Further Discussion on Development of a Green Building Incentive and the Current Green Building Ordinance.

Councilor Marshall wanted to know from the committee what they felt would work better for promoting green building. He also asked if the committee should be considering all aspects of green building including resource conservation, building performance, and waste water. Getz wanted to focus on building performance. Pulaski was interested in the whole building performance because just energy performance could result in a poorly performing building such as air quality. Belleau was interested in the reduction of oil usage. O-Neil said that Portland's natural gas usage is higher proportionally than the rest of the state. Marshall stated that city buildings are converting to Natural gas from fuel oil.

Pitman asked if at the previous meeting there was discussion of what sectors the Committee is trying to address? Marshall stated that the current ordinance specifies 10,000 sf and above \$250,000. Boxer felt that it is important in the Committee's discussion to bring developers who are on the fence about a high performance building to actually construct one. 5% of developers are already constructing green.

Marshall asked about third party review related to the current green building ordinance.

Pulaski wanted to know how we were going to go to the next level whether it was charging a fee, or abatement, or a density bonus and what would work best to promote developers on the fence to actually construct a green building. Pulaski wanted to know what options there were available for incentivizing green building. Jaegerman stated that there was an affordable housing bonus used to incentivize affordable housing construction.

Shinberg asked if anybody could explain the performance difference between MUBEC and LEED. Pulaski responded that MUBEC requires ASHRAE 90.1 and LEED requires that minimum certification is 10% better than ASHRAE 90.1.

Belleau mentioned using energy performance scores for buildings particular residential and new construction as well as renovations.

Pitman mentioned for existing buildings that incentives could be applied by energy performance change rather than targets so that new owners could benefit from the incentive down the road. Marshall added that it was important to include renovations in the discussion. Getz liked the idea of incremental change versus a standard. Pulaski also added the importance of focusing on existing buildings.

Boxer wanted to know what the potential options were for offering incentives whether it included permits and tax abatements. Houseal stated that the City did not have control over the tax assessments. Getz added that he also wanted to know the world of options for incentivizing: monetary and non-monetary. O'Neil asked for the state programs that are available to make sure the Committee is not being redundant.

Marshall said that there might need to be multiple approaches to different sectors.

4. Confirm Date for Next Meeting: The next meeting is currently scheduled for April 28, 2011.

5. Adjourn