October 5, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To : Planning Commission, ASCC, BEET Committee
From : George Mader, Town Planner
Subject : Joint Meeting on October 8 re Global Warming

NOTE: This memo is intended to serve as an agenda for the meeting. We should decide at the beginning of the meeting if changes to the agenda are needed.

Introduction

The joint meeting is scheduled for Monday night at 8:00 PM in the Historic School House. The purpose of the meeting is to develop a dialogue between the three bodies since all three are involved with specific programs that will be put into action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the town.

Relationships Between BEET, ASCC and Planning Commission

The BEET committee has been working on their recommendations for about a year and has gone further in developing approaches than have the planning commission and ASCC. The ASCC has been involved in seeing that voluntary evaluation forms are filled out for new construction projects. In addition, the ASCC routinely considers aspects of green building when reviewing new construction. The planning commission started considering global warming at its meeting on 8/29/07 and then held a second meeting on the topic on 9/26/07.

A challenge, as we move ahead on this, is to determine the areas of responsibility between the three groups. Since no one has clearly delineated the relationships, let me provide some suggestions:

> BEET committee has been responsible for providing an overview of buildings, energy efficiency and transportation. Some members of the committee, in addition to providing a broad perspective, have technical knowledge of potential regulations and programs. There needs to be some definition of what the committee's involvement will be as the program moves ahead. Will it perform an oversight function or will it be involved in actually developing programs and regulations? The committee should expand on this.
>
> The ASCC is the most technically qualified body to deal with the architectural aspects of green building. It would appear that the focus on green building should reside with the ASCC. What are the attitudes of the commission on this?

It may be worthwhile to consider regular periodic joint meetings of BEET, ASCC and planning commission to ensure coordination. To economize on everyone's time, these might be scheduled as part of regular agendas for the ASCC and planning commission.

Specific Topics for Discussion

1. Ideas for undertaking the "*Processes*" part of the BEET committee. This can be of assistance to staff as this work commences.

2. Who will take the lead in developing a mandatory rating system including the point system to be established? What should be a reasonable time target?

3. Tom Vlasic has suggested the following topics for discussion:

   a. Framework for a Green Building Compliance program:
      1) Residential uses (new houses, major additions, remodelings)
      2) Non-residential uses (CUP's, PUD's, etc.)
      3) Non-permit related activities:
         Recycling (electronic waste, etc. in town)
         Buying of green materials
         Green decisions re: travel (vehicles, air travel, etc.)
         Carbon off-sets (town brokering with other communities to provide off-set purchases like wind farms, etc.)

   b. Opportunities and constraints associated with town initiatives:
      1) Most "bang for the buck"
      2) Staffing implications for oversight, tracking and communications
      3) Trade-offs: aesthetics (realities not just rehetoric)

   4. Schedule (Tentative)
      1) ASCC and BEET committee should submit ideas for general plan provisions for consideration by the planning commission. These might be considered at meetings on 11/7/07 or 12/5/07. This should include policies as well as specific programs.
      2) The planning commission should submit recommendations to the town council in December or January. (More likely late December and January)

encl.

cc. Ted Driscoll
Steve Toben
Maryann Derwin
Sandy Sloan
Angela Howard
Leslie Lambert

Architectural and Site Control Commission **October 8, 2007**

Special Joint Meeting with Planning Commission & BEET Committee*
Relative to Global Warming & Recommendations of Town Climate Protection Task Force
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

**Building, Energy Efficiency and Transportation Committee* of the Climate Protection Task Force.

Chairman Gelpi called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Gelpi, Breen, Clark, Warr, Von Feldt
Absent: None
Planning Commission: Elkind, McIntosh, McKitterick, Zaffaroni
Absent: Wengert
Town Council ASCC Liaison: Merk
Town Council Planning Commission Liaison and
Council liaison to Climate Protection Task Force: Derwin
Town Council Liaison to Climate Protection Task Force: Toben
Town Staff: Town Planner Mader, Deputy Town Planner Vlasic,
Planning Manager Lambert, Planning Technician Borck
BEET Committee Representatives:
Craig Breon
Jim Stoecker

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Joint Study Session - Global Warming and Consideration of BEET Committee Recommendations as Referred to the Planning Commission and ASCC by the Town Council

Vlasic presented the October 5, 2007 staff report with attachments and provided an overview of the attachments, as well as the discussions that took place at the 8/29/07 and 9/26/07 planning commission meetings and 10/4/07 town council meeting. He noted that while the town council had directed that the town planner's office work with the planning commission and ASCC to implement the "process" part of the 10/4/07 BEET committee "Cool PV" outline, it would likely not be possible to simply address the "process" without getting into the matter of a rating system for new residential construction and for evaluating other more significant development projects in the town. He noted that a major component of the LEED H pilot program for residential projects includes the initial design processes that actually begin before any actual plans are developed.

Vlasic also offered that any "green building" program would have an impact on staff resources and that this would need to be taken into account in program development. He referenced the draft job description for the one year "Resource Efficiency Coordinator," and noted that this position would not really fill the responsibilities that would be associated

least 30%. It was understood that any potential rating system to be used in the town should look at what can be accomplished with Title 24 and consider the "green" areas that are not covered or addressed in Title 24 provisions.

Town input to U.S. Green Building Council. Warr commented that the town could also play an important role with the U.S. Green Building Council, i.e., the source of the LEED program, by providing input on program adjustments that appear needed to ensure success in a community like Portola Valley. He noted that other communities like the town are also struggling with how to best tailor any rating system to their circumstances and that the town could help the Building Council in considering possible, appropriate adjustments to ensure LEED H success and as broad application as possible. It was generally agreed that the LEED H pilot program should be the focus of consideration, but it was also understood that this program would be evolving and adjusting and likely continue to do so for some time.

Council clarifications. Derwin and Toben clarified that the council was seeking specific recommendations from the ASCC and planning commission with the directive that a process could be in place no later than July 1, 2008. Derwin also stressed that the record of town council discussion and action at the October 4, 2007 meeting should be made available to ASCC and planning commissioners to assist them in pursuing the work requested by the town council.

Roles for BEET Committee. It was understood that the BEET committee would continue to serve as a critical resource to the ASCC and planning commission. BEET committee representatives advised that the data developed during the committee's work over the last year would be shared and that committee member Linda Yates had offered make her "LEED" consultants available to the town to also assist with the town's efforts.

BEET committee representative Breon noted that one of the important tasks the committee also wanted to now pursue is to determine how best to "get the green word out" to existing residents/homeowners that would not be subject to any building review process or "green" rating system. He commented that this is a large "area" where work is needed and particularly important in terms of achieving the objectives recommended by the BEET committee and supported by town council actions. He advised that the committee is considering outreach to schools, a "welcome wagon" campaign for new residents and also working with established homeowners associations.

Summary of Individual Discussion Comments:

(Note: because of the scope of comments and nature of the study session discussion, the following summary does not attempt to list all comments made or suggestions offered. An effort has been made, however, to record the key comments with direct bearing on the "next steps" noted above. It is also understood that many of the comments and suggestions will be developed further, during the future meetings of the ASCC, planning commission, and BEET committee, including the agreed to work session.)

The comments that follow are listed by individual in, for the most part, the order that individual comments were provided. It is noted, however, that the discussion was more informal and somewhat back-and-forth. Nonetheless, individuals are only listed once with

- It is recognized that design trade-offs will be needed to achieve some of the "green" standards and objectives, for example roof materials and fuel management as called for in some of the PUD provisions. These will also have to be approached with care.

- Cost of labor in the Bay Area encourages more tear-downs (and then hopefully recycling) than it does reuse of structures. "Clients" are extremely cost sensitive and while they are very interested in "green building" options, when they face cost decisions, the options for green building become expendable. Trade-offs are improving and will likely in time favor "green" alternatives, but they are not fully there yet.

- There may be some incentives that can be used to encourage "green" alternatives, but the most effective are things like a floor area bonus, and these are not necessarily consistent with the intent of LEEDs or other rating systems.

- The town's existing voluntary green building checklist has raised awareness, but ultimately some mandatory system will be needed to really make a difference.

- There are, roughly, only 12 new houses constructed in the town in any one year. Thus, the biggest impact in terms of construction will be with remodeling and additions and retrofitting of existing houses. It is likely that the biggest influence can ultimately be made with long-term residents who are maintaining and upgrading their homes and properties. A program for outreach and encouragement to these residents will be essential to any overall town "green" effort.

Toben:

- The town's planning documents stress that the natural conditions and natural system matter the most and this is the fundamental principle guiding land use and lands use decisions in the town. A second fundamental principle, and extension of the first, should be that all development is "sustainable" and consistent with greenhouse gas reduction objectives. There may be a potential for some conflict between these principles and that will need to be considered as the town's sustainability program is fully developed and implemented.

- There are a number of options for a local green building system ranging from simply enhanced Title 24 requirements to a full LEED H type system. If the ASCC and planning commission process results in recommending a very simple process, e.g., all projects must exceed Title 24 by some significant percentage, that might be acceptable, but it would need to be considered in terms of achieving the overall objectives of the town.

- The BEET committee efforts to encourage changes to existing housing stock, i.e., for people to do the right thing and "green-up," is important. Further, any point system needs to pursue the "path of least resistance" to ensure its success. It should strive to, at least at first, grasp the "low hanging fruit." Further, the town efforts need to help make sense out of a complicated system.

Zaffaroni/Elkind:

- Any green building program should be "rolled in" without mandating standards. It should be simple and there should be incentives to encourage clients to implement green building provisions. Any system should be directed at encouraging people to voluntarily "want" to pursue green efforts and it should not result in longer design review or building permit processes.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m.

T. Vlasic