Green Building Program Update
City Working Group Meeting #5 Notes
February 26, 2019

<u>Meeting Minutes</u>
Robyn Eason started the meeting by confirming overarching project goals, confirming that the proposed recommendations are in line with the feedback received from the December 2018 meeting, discussing the concurrent and related initiatives that will be address through a separate efforts, and reviewing project timeline and next steps in this process.

Overarching project goals
- Utilize existing state building code as basis for green building blocks
- Categorically align WeHo requirements with CALGreen
- Strikeout duplicate language in municipal code
- Keep existing green building measures that are locally specific and/or more stringent than state code
- Introduce new local green building requirements

Progress since last working group meeting
- Site Planning and Design
  - Performed additional research on sustainable roof treatments and open space flexibility and made updates based on discussions with City of San Francisco and Denver.
    - Developed percentage requirements based on research so there is better parity between costs of three roof options
    - Modified the project applicability to all projects with 10K sf or more
  - Updates to the flexibility of open space
    - Allowing projects to put all of open space on rooftop if it is 30% is vegetated
- Energy
  - CA energy code is the most stringent code in the country and does a good job on its own
  - Not going to touch energy code, but will look at strengthening commissioning and inspection process
  - We are introducing energy benchmarking readiness policies with the GB update. Will require new projects of 20,000SF or more to register with Energy Star.
- Water
  - Adjusted the applicability requirements based on group's feedback
- Waste
  - Revised storage and collection requirements for solid waste and recycling, plus new requirements for organics
- Green Pubic Buildings
  - Raised minimum threshold from LEED Certified to LEED Gold

<u>Green Building Recommendations & Discussion</u>

1. **Incentives**
   a. What is the incremental benefit for us as a city to have someone go from LEED Silver to Gold? Does that value make sense for the types of incentives we are offering?

b. We should put a dollar amount to these incentives to understand what the City is giving away with the voluntary measures.
c. Need to make the high achieving measure cost about 50% of the developer's profit however it is difficult to quantify. Can we put an approximate dollar value on each of these high achieving measures? Are we getting that as a city and community that is worth half that much?
d. It is hard to put a quantifiable amount to how much more green a building is at certain LEED levels. It is better to consider the outcome of what having greener buildings mean for the city: buildings using less energy and water and less toxins, reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, reduced heat islands, increased vegetation – a community more responsive to climate change.
e. There is a benefit to the citizens of the world? Not talking about a direct benefit. What is the benefit of 500K worth of PV, how much energy savings is that, how much reduction of greenhouse gas is that, etc.? Citizens of the world are getting is energy used without the burning of fossil fuels.
f. Could we tie this into how the incentives are contributing to a more sustainable world?
g. Some of the high achieving measures are low hanging fruit for certain projects. It will be easy for larger projects to implement a high achieving measures for a very low cost vs a smaller project that will struggle to make it financially work.
h. High-achieving measures are a first step for the city to be aspirational and push the development community further than standard green building practice. Not all buildings will be able to achieve, but it establishes the tone for what the city wants to see and the types of features in buildings the city wants constructed as redevelopment occurs. The bar will continue to change as the industry and technology evolves.

2. **Site Planning and Design**
    a. Sustainable Roof Treatments
        i.   Basing the sustainable roof treatments as percentages is a problem; it should be based on performance.
        ii. Applicant should just provide a calculation that a certain percentage of energy need is being satisfied earlier in the process
        iii. Use performance based standards for PV and solar thermal; vegetative roofs remain as a percentage. Correlate PVs to annual anticipated energy use PV could be KV/SF
        iv. City will need to use State approved energy modeling
        v.   The performance metric is about building performance, there needs to be some documentation. Moving the process to planning entitlements vs. plan check
        vi. Vegetated should have a minimum soil depth, there should be a metric in the definition for vegetated roofs
        vii. Are there any potential conflicts between cool roofs and other sustainable roof treatments? Staff will double check that there are not conflicts or issues with the cool roof requirement and sustainable roof measurs
    b. Open space flexibility
        i.   The flexibility provision for allowing all of the common and private open space to be on the roof is unclear
        ii. Unsure if requiring the 30 percent vegetated roof for rooftop open space is the right metric
        iii. Goal of ground floor open space is about landscaping and permeability

iv. Parking space for vegetated space
1. 1:1 parking replacement should be "on ground" instead of "at grade." Don't need to provide a minimum soil depth. Are there additional requirements as to where this is located? Should it be located in required yards?
2. It doesn't matter if the 1:1 replacement happens within or outside the setback area. This allows us to have landscape that is not over a parking garage.
3. 1:1 replacement is the footprint of the parking space
4. The new vegetated space should also include one a minimum 36" box canopy tree and include a list of approved trees.
5. Should have a minimum dimension of five feet.
6. Revise language to say for every 200 square feet of landscape, you can reduce one parking space