Department of Commerce

Puget Sound Regional Council

Building Green Cities - Advisory Committee Meeting
WSU Extension - Washington Stormwater Center - 2606 W Pioneer Avenue, Puyallup WA 98371
Puyallup Room
Call-in Option: SKYPE Meeting 1+ (206) 413-7142 Access Code: 75535489
June 28, 2018
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
AGENDA

Meeting Purposes:

- Recap of the project
- Provide high-level summary of the literature review (motivators and barriers)
- Finalize the selection criteria for recruiting interviewees
- Discuss topic areas for the interview guide and preliminary interview questions
- Solicit ideas for potential interviewees (if time permits)

Time	Topic	Lead
1:00 – 1:10 pm	Welcome	Charlene Andrade (Department of Commerce)
1:10 – 1:20 pm	Recap of Building Green Cities Project	Charlene Andrade (Commerce) Gretchen Muller (Cascadia)
1:20 – 1:30 pm	High-level Summary of Literature Review Findings	Gretchen Muller (Cascadia)
1:30 – 2:00 pm	Selection Criteria for Interview Guide	Jessica Branom-Zwick (Cascadia) Nancy Hardwick (Hardwick Research)
2:00 – 2:45 pm	Topic Areas for Interview Guide and Preliminary Interview Questions	Jessica Branom-Zwick (Cascadia) Nancy Hardwick (Hardwick Research)
2:45 – 3:00 pm	Next Steps and Adjourn	Charlene Andrade (Commerce)
OPTIONAL		
3:00 – 3:30 pm	Continued Discussion about Preliminary Interview Questions	Jessica Branom-Zwick (Cascadia) Nancy Hardwick (Hardwick Research)

Building Green Cities Contact List

Project Team

Charlene Andrade, Co-lead	Washington Department of Commerce	charlene.andrade@commerce.wa.gov
Linda Bentley, Co-lead	Washington Department of Commerce	Linda.bentley@commerce.wa.gov
Erika Harris	Puget Sound Regional Council	eharris@psrc.org

Advisory Committee Members

Name	Affiliation	Email
Erika Harris	Puget Sound Regional Council	eharris@psrc.org
Mindy Roberts	Washington Environmental Council	mindy@wecprotects.org
Paul Crane	City of Everett	pcrane@everettwa.gov
Peg Staeheli	MIG/SvR Consulting	pstaeheli@migcom.com
Micki McNaughton	Arborea, LLC	mickimcn@gmail.com
Heidi Siegelbaum	Washington Stormwater Center, WSU	heidi.siegelbaum@wsu.edu
Chris Wierzbicki	FutureWise	chris@futurewise.org
Jessie Israel	The Nature Conservancy	jessie.israel@tnc.org
Dave Ward	Kitsap County	dward@co.kitsap.wa.us
John Palmer	Environmental Protection Agency	John.Palmer@epa.gov
Amy Waterman	FutureWise	amyw@futurewise.org
Jessica Knickerbocker	City of Tacoma	jknicker@ci.tacoma.wa.us
Linden Lampman	WA Department of Natural Resources	linden.lampman@dnr.wa.gov
Carrie Sanneman	Willamette Partnership	sanneman@willamettepartnership.org
Steven Fry	Seattle District 2030	stevenfry@2030districts.org
Brigid Dean	Washington Deparment of Transportation	deanb@wsdot.wa.gov
Aaron Clark	Stewardship Partners	ac@stewardshippartners.org
Jeff Killelea	WA Department of Ecology	jeff.killelea@ecy.wa.gov
Ben Marre	City of Seattle	Ben.Marre@seattle.gov

Consultant Lead

Gretchen Muller	Cascadia	gretchen@cascadiaconsulting.com

Role of the Building Green Cities Advisory Committee

The Building Green Cities advisory committee is a collection of individuals who bring unique knowledge which augments the knowledge of the Project and Consulting team, in order to assist in implementing the Project. The advisory committee is made up of voluntary members and they informally advise, but do not have formal authority to govern the project nor issue directives which must be followed. Rather, the advisory committee serves to explore creative ideas and solutions, offer insights, make recommendations and/or provide key information and materials to assist the Project.

Since the project team has ultimate governance authority, the advisory committee is able to focus on a specific topic. The advisory committee may provide feedback on the performance of the project, review and assess deliverables when requested, gather input from or serve as a liaison with relevant constituencies or the community, provide technical expertise, and assist staff in identifying important activities. Their role is to offer assistance, provide wise counsel, insights, and support exploration of ideas. Their role ***is not to*** progress agendas, direct, or preclude decisions.

The Building Green Cities advisory committee can contribute knowledge/skills to the Project Team and consultant in a variety of ways, in an adaptive manner that is specific to the needs of the Project Team and task at hand. Every effort shall be made by the consultant and Project Team to incorporate insights, input, and recommendations from the Advisory Committee, within the objectives, scope, time, and budget of the Project. However, the Project Team and Consultant reserve the right to proceed independently of input provided.

The Project Team and Consultant shall manage input from the committee in a general way that can help progress the project but shall not include strict recordings of comments and responses. Communication and reviews with and by the Committee can be accomplished in a variety of way in order to support effective and timely input, without delaying the project timelines. The Commerce Project team shall assist in messaging the requests and describing the pathway for communications in an adaptive manner in order to guide the interactions, and reiterating roles, but will look to the consultant to capture and address input. The Advisory Committee is asked to direct questions and input to the Commerce Project Team directly, with a cc to the Consultant. The Project Team can assist with resolving any miscommunications or conflicting input, and can serve as final decision-maker.

Document Listing as of June 28

Bicknell, J., prepared for Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program. 2010. *Understanding Barriers to LID Implementation.*

Building Industry Association of WA. 2013. *Building Successful Low Impact Developments.*

Center for Neighborhood Technology. 2010. *The Value of Green Infrastructure: A Guide to Recognizing its Economic, Environmental, and Social Benefits.*

CH2MHill, prepared for Puget Sound Partnership. 2010. *Survey of Local Governments that Participated in the 2005-2009 LID Local Regulation Assistance Project*.

Clean Water America Alliance. No date. *Barriers and Gateways to Green Infrastructure.*

Copeland, C., prepared for Congressional Research Service. 2016. *Green Infrastructure and Issues in Managing Urban Stormwater*.

Credit Valley Conservation. No date. *Low Impact Development Business and Multi-Residential Retrofits: Optimizing Your Bottom Line through Low Impact Development.*

ECONorthwest. 2011. *Managing Stormwater in Redevelopment and Greenfield Development Projects Using Green Infrastructure: Economic Factors that Influence Developers' Decisions.*

Futurewise. 2016. *Low Impact Development/Green Stormwater Infrastructure Lay of the Land Report: On-the-ground realities in King County.*

Godwin, D.C., Chan, S.A., Burris, F.A., prepared for Oregon State University. 2008. *Barriers and Opportunities for Low Impact Development: Case Studies from Three Oregon Communities.*

Hassan. F., prepared for the Canadian Water Network. 2015. *Policy Direction to Fast Track Low Impact Development (LID) Technologies Across Canada.*

Houston-Galveston Area Council. No date. *Designing for Impact: A Regional Guide to Low Impact Development.*

King County. 2007. *Model Low Impact Development Strategies for Big Box Retail Stores.*

MacMullan, E, Reich, S, prepared for the Rock Creek Sustainability Initiative. 2009. *Low Impact Development at the Local Level: Developers' Experiences and City and County Support.*

Murphy, T., Ryan-Peñuela, E., McCarty, K., Ramos, A., Kelly, A., prepared for Puget Sound Partnership. 2015. *Green Infrastructure Policy Integration in Puget Sound Municpalities.*

U.S. EPA. 2010. *Green Infrastructure Case Studies: Municipal Policies for Managing Stormwater with Green Infrastructure.*

Proposed Interview Selection Criteria

June 26, 2018

During recruitment calls, we will seek to obtain 20 to 25 developers who represent a mix of the key desired characteristics. During recruitment calls, we will ask to speak to the development company owner or a project manager who is responsible for making decisions regarding to what extent low impact development will be incorporated in to the properties the company develops.

Selection Criteria	Seek mix of					Do not interview if
1. Business role(s)	Land developer		Building developer		Development consultant	Only other roles
2. Development experience	Prefer 5+ years					Fewer than 3 years
3. Neighborhood type(s)	Urban		Suburban			Only rural or small towns
4. Building type(s) 5. Housing type(s)	Commercial		Mixed-use *subsidized*	Mixed-use *market rate*	Multifamily *subsidized*	Multifamily *market rate*	Only single-family or other types
6. Project size(s)	Large		Medium		Small		
7. Site constraints	Flow control required or inside regional growth areas		Flow control exempt and outside regional growth areas			
8. Land type(s)	Redevelopment		New development			
9. Company type	Multi-state corporation	Washington corporation	Individual or local business	Non-profit		

Questions for Advisory Committee:

- Are these your top selection criteria? If not, which criteria would you replace? Are any criteria not essential?
- Within each criterion:
  - Are these the right categories to include and exclude from interviews?
  - Should we focus on certain categories more than others, or seek to distribute interviews roughly evenly?
  - How would you define large, medium, and small projects?
- What job titles or responsibilities should we use when looking for the right person to talk to?

Preliminary Interview Questions

Interviews will last 30 minutes.

CURRENT USE OF LID

- How do you decide what stormwater management methods to use on your projects? What are the most important factors you consider when choosing among stormwater management methods?
    - *Literature review suggests factors include regulatory requirements, site constraints (geology, hydrology, and existing paving/system), hard costs (e.g., equipment), soft costs (e.g., labor), permit review times, incentives, market demand, my team's familiarity with management methods/options, ability to use low-risk/proven methods; inspector preferences.*
- To what extent do you currently use LID on your projects?
    - What share of your projects include <u>any</u> LID elements at all?
    - What share of your projects manage <u>all or most</u> stormwater through LID?
- Recent changes in regulations require projects to use LID unless infeasible. How, if at all, did this change how you approach stormwater management on your projects?
    - IF CHANGED PRACTICES: are there differences between project sizes, building types, land types, or other factors?
- On what types of projects are you most likely to use LID methods?
    - *For example, it may vary by building type, project size, land type, luxury/market/affordable customers, redevelopment/new development, certain geology/hydrology, specific municipalities.*
- When you use LID as the primary stormwater management method, why do you make that choice?
    - *Literature review suggests motivators often relate to reducing cost, reducing construction and permit review time, reducing risk (e.g., of failing inspection), increasing sale price (meeting market demand), obtaining incentives (if structured to provide value).*

BARRIERS TO USING LID

- What are your biggest barriers to using LID as the primary stormwater management method on your projects?
    - *Lit review identified these potential barriers: site constraints (geology, hydrology, existing paving or systems), costs (hard and soft), additional design time/effort, concerns about risk of unfamiliar LID methods, engineering staff lack expertise to design LID, concern that LID increases permit review time/complexity, concern that inspectors will require conventional stormwater system as backup, lack of market demand (clients won't pay more or don't want LID).*
    - PROBE: Are there differences between project sizes, building types, land types, or other factors?
- What would help you overcome these barriers?

MOTIVATORS: WHAT CAN CITIES AND COUNTIES DO TO ENCOURAGE YOU TO USE LID METHODS?

Common incentives and programs include direct financial incentives (e.g., reduced permitting or impact fees, tax rebates, grants), code variances (e.g., ability to build more units, build taller, avoid other requirements), expedited permitting, financial incentive for buyer (e.g., reduced annual stormwater fees), information or technical assistance (e.g., consultation from LID expert/inspector, infiltration/soil maps, information on LID options).

- What municipal incentives/programs for LID have you participated in on your projects?
  - What worked well about those programs?
  - What could be improved?
- What incentives or programs could cities and counties offer that would motivate you to use LID more frequently on your projects?
- Here's a list of potential incentive/program types that cities and counties may consider. Which are most attractive to you? *(Show list such as reduced permitting fee, reduced impact fee, expedited review, etc.)*
  - FOLLOW UP: For the ones that are most attractive to you, can you describe what that program should look like to effectively motivate you to manage all or almost all stormwater using LID?

Questions for Advisory Committee:

- What does it look like to meet the requirement of using LID unless infeasible?
  - What does it look like to "go above and beyond" this requirement?
  - What, using tangible language, are we trying to get developers to change?
- What type and level of incentives and programs are cities willing (or unwilling) to offer?