



Utilities

electric · stormwater · wastewater · water
700 Wood Street
PO Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522

970.221.6700

970.221.6619 – fax
970.224.6003 – TDD
utilities@fcgov.com
fcgov.com/utilities

**C-TRAC
Meeting # 2
Topic: IgCC Chapter 4
Wednesday May 19, 2010, 3 – 5:30 pm**

PARTICIPANTS

Utilities Green Building Team

Amanda Sutton – Green Building Program Coordinator

Felix Lee – Green Building Code Project Manager

Gary Schroeder – Energy Engineer – Commercial GB Code Review

Facilitator

Susanne Durkin-Schindler

Consultant

Steve Brunner - The Brendle Group

Subject Matter Experts

Marc Virata – Transportation Engineering - Development Review,
Civil Engineer III

Basil Hamdan – Water Engineering - Stormwater, Civil Engineer II

Glen Schlueter – Water Engineering - Stormwater, Civil Engineer III

Steve Olt - Current Planning, City Planner

C-TRAC Members

Company	Representative
Aller Lingle Massey Architects PC	Brad Massey
Beaudin-Ganze Consulting Engineers	Corey Rhodes
BHA Design	Angela Milewski
Realtec	Peter Kast
Dohn Construction	Doug Dohn
Nolte & Associates	Jeff Giles
Starwood Construction Mgmt	Sandy Willison
Milender White Construction	Ema Rankin
Fisher Architecture	Greg Fisher

IFMA	Matt Horner
Architecture West	Steve Steinbicker
PSD	Pete Hall

Announcements:
July 7th meeting was changed to June 30th.

Key Points:

Meeting Ground Rules- Susanne Durkin-Schindler

TRAC Member Participation Expectations

1. Arrive on time
2. Minimize interruptions by turning off your cell phones, pagers, etc.
3. Raise your hand before speaking
4. Respect groups time and meeting time table
5. Listen as allies
- 6. Treat all participants with respect – ideas may be challenged-not the speaker**
- 7. Notify a staff person if you are going to be absent - do your homework and let us know if you have any comments. Three absences will result in the end of your participation on the team.**

Green Building Standards Comparison

Steve Brunner - The Brendle Group

The standards comparison tool is continuing to be developed. Steve created a "comparison test" tab in the comparison tool that allows the user to compare similar subcategories of different standards next to each other without having to have to move throughout the other tabs of the spreadsheet.

The Benchmark project: We received several comments on possible pilot projects. Steve will be contacting the building contractors/owners to see what data is available. Information on the selected project will be sent out as soon as it has been selected.

IgCC Chapter 4: Site Development - Felix Lee

At the last meeting on May 5, 2010, we discussed Chapter 3 and the jurisdictional options for adopting the IgCC. We will be going back to that at the end of this review process to fill out Table 302.2.

Chapter 4 of the IgCC overlaps with existing City and State regulations. City staff has been going through this chapter to determine the best plan of action for the green building code. This comparison was done in parallel with the NGBS comparison as well. Both codes are included on the matrix. Staff

identified areas for potential improvements in the current City Code as well as areas where the City Code is more stringent than the IgCC. Staff found that most of Chapter 4 is covered in City codes and regulations and is recommending to the committee that we exclude Chapter 4 from the code and defer to existing City regulations.

In order to give a clear picture of this analysis to Council and the community, staff has developed a comparison matrix for Chapter 4 and City/Land Use Codes. The C-TRAC team will provide additional insight on current codes and any challenges/barriers to green building that may exist.

Committee Discussion of Chapter 4 Matrix:

Non-potable Water for Irrigation

This section is designed to reduce resource use related to water treatment and distribution by using municipal reclaimed water for irrigation. The City Code does not prohibit the use of municipal reclaimed water, but current infrastructure does not exist to support this system. This type of use could also apply to a private entity that filters their water through a private water treatment facility on site (i.e., New Belgium).

We have two water sources that supply Fort Collins. We can reuse water from Horsetooth Reservoir (Colorado Big Thompson) but not from the Poudre River. The City knows how much water we get from each source even though it all gets mixed together in the process. Estimates are based on a percentage. The City would have to look at how private water treatment plants would impact the amount of water being returned to the Poudre and how to keep track of and regulate that use. City staff such as Susan Smolnik or Kevin Gertig could shed more light on this.

Staff recommends that we do not limit this option for development if it makes sense for the project. It is important to note that if this water were to be provided by the City it would require substantial infrastructure development that would have high capital costs because it would require the construction of another treatment plant and associated piping.

Raw water can be used for irrigation if the company has water rights. The IgCC does not directly address the use of raw water for irrigation. The City does not restrict raw water use as long as they have the required water rights. One incentive to increase the use of raw water may be financial through a reduction in water costs for using raw water over treated water.

There is not a lot of incentive for a raw water system. There are still tap fees for raw water - it may not work to downsize taps because of the need to plan for seasons when raw water is not available. That being said, you don't

have to pay as much in wastewater fees for raw water used, so that is a small incentive.

City could consider providing financial incentives or reduction in fees for raw water use. We need to make sure the City is able to accommodate these incentives. Note that use of municipal reclaimed water or raw water would earn LEED points for using non-potable water for irrigation.

Landscape water use is much higher than other consumptive use. We need to focus on reducing the demand of water for landscapes before we start looking at infrastructure for raw/reclaimed water irrigation systems.

Building Site Waste Management Plan

This section addresses the recycling or salvage of land clearing debris and soils associated with developing the landscape. There are currently no requirements that state these materials must be recycled. Many developers will recycle these materials to avoid landfill tipping fees, but there is still a lot of this material going to the landfill. Builders are currently taking asphalt and concrete to be recycled at Hoffman Mill because it is free of charge, whereas they have to pay at the landfill.

The financial incentives currently exist, but there needs to be more education to make sure that people are aware of them. One idea is to use the City of Loveland's composting site as a drop off location for land clearing debris or developing a similar site in Fort Collins.

One member suggested that if the City is going to regulate private landscape development waste, the City should also regulate the waste from public projects.

Mass Transit

This section requires that the developer provide easy access to mass transit to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In Fort Collins, the developer does not have control over what areas are served by mass transit. The infrastructure may not be in place yet. The Transportation Planning Department would like to provide incentives for transit ready development (TRD) design such as smaller parking lots, area for future bus stops, etc.

TRD includes several pieces including parking size and connectivity. An interim step is to provide transit from development to transit. Staff needs to look at all of those aspects and provide incentives for those sections to make this requirement more specific.

If a development is built along a major road in the City it should be built to accommodate mass transit (street design, bus stops, right-of-way, etc.). This is a Plan Fort Collins topic. It also ties into the mixed-use equation.

Mixed Use Development

This section is designed to encourage mixed-use development to reduce vehicle miles traveled. The City allows this type of development but it is not done very often in Fort Collins.

There have been several developers that have tried to develop mixed-use sites, but they have had trouble getting lenders to back the projects. This shouldn't be limited based on the fact that lenders aren't supporting it, their stance will probably change as the market changes.

One challenge is parking. The current code may not allow enough parking to be functional for all types of mixed-use development. Most mixed-use developments are coded for two types of parking; the minimum for residential and the maximum for the type of commercial use.

Another challenge may be the current zoning of the city. For some mixed-use development, the land use that is considered by zoning may not be the use the developer wants (i.e. Residential/commercial building listed as residential). Change in values is another challenge to mixed-use development in Fort Collins. According to one C-TRAC member, most neighbors seem to dislike this type of development and rally against it (e.g., apartment building in their neighborhood); and once this type of development is built it is often difficult to sell commercial space (e.g. Penny Flats) and many people who live in the building are still commuting to their offices. Questions regarding the purpose of this type of development arise.

In Longmont, Officials have noted that mixed-use development tends to be both residential and commercial where the commercial space is below and the residences are above. There have been very few parking related issues associated with this development. This is probably because the people who live in the building are leaving when the commercial site opens.

Soil Disturbance and Erosion

The intent of this section is to reduce pollution and erosion, retain soil quality and conserve native flora and fauna by minimizing soil disturbance and sedimentation during construction.

The City does not currently have anything in the code to encourage the development to follow the natural contours of the land or minimize the disturbance to the land. The only thing limiting is cost; it is more expensive to

move more dirt on a project. The City and State both have stormwater regulations that address soil erosion mitigation.

The City could consider incentives for low impact development. Planning the site ahead of time and taking the natural features of the site into consideration while doing this plan. There are other municipalities that have this policy. Some incentives do exist, but we need to highlight them more clearly. If the City does this, there needs to be a balance. According to a City staff member, in some cases it is appropriate and beneficial for a developer to remove more soil and we shouldn't to discourage those situations.

Density:

This section is designed to encourage higher density development to reduce infrastructure resource costs. The City currently has several zones that have density requirements, but not all. The City is looking at updating some zones to encourage higher density development. The urban zones can allow cluster development to preserve natural areas. Cluster development is not a type of zone but a concept that can be applied. There are few areas left in the City that can accommodate that.

Infill

The intent of this section is to make efficient use of existing land and infrastructure, preserve open space and limit Greenfield development. Currently, the definition of the City for infill is different than the IgCC. The City's infill area goes from Vine to Harmony Road then from Overland to Timberline. The IgCC definition is:

1. A vacant lot or collection of adjoining lots, located in an established, developed area that is already served by existing infrastructure.
2. A previously developed lot which is being redeveloped.

It may be beneficial to align these two definitions to help reduce confusion.

Stormwater Management:

This section is designed to manage stormwater loads on site to reduce offsite impacts and improve water quality. The City currently has stormwater regulations that are more comprehensive than the IgCC. One way to improve current practices is to encourage the use of pervious surfaces for parking lots and sidewalks. The City allows the use of these technologies, but they tend to be more expensive and need more maintenance than conventional paving.

Electives and Code

One C-TRAC member noted that additional clarity is needed to understand how this system is going to work and if the City eliminates Chapter 4 from the IgCC and defers to existing City regulations, builders would lose the available electives for that chapter. Furthermore, the member went on to say It would be difficult to mandate that the builder comply with Chapter 4 of the

IgCC when they may not have control over how the site is developed; and it would make more sense for developers to defer to City Code. Staff could recommend to include some of the electives in the code in addition to meeting City regulations.

Staff noted the C-TRAC is talking about providing incentives, but it is important to understand where these incentives or "brownie points" are going to come from. The City currently has a prescriptive code and it is not yet clear as to what it means to have incentives for that code. The C-TRAC also needs to keep going back to enforcement and how these codes and incentives are going to be enforced. Currently, engineers are the ones who are inspecting properties and they charge a fee to the developer to come out and perform an inspection. Need to be careful that changes to the code do not create additional financial disincentives for the developer.

A C-TRAC member commented concerning the need to be clear about what an incentive is for the IgCC vs. an elective. The electives can count towards the code as a whole. If we don't adopt Chapter 4, how can we have electives from that chapter? There are parts of Chapter 4 that could be affected by the builder. The code mixes these together which could be a mistake. According to the C-TRAC member, the group would like further discussion about the sections that relate directly to the building. The builder does not always have direct control over the lot development but there are aspects of Chapter 4 that the builder does have control of. If we do not adopt the chapter some of that may get lost. The C-TRAC member would like some of these sections to remain an option for electives toward satisfying the overall code requirements and defer to existing regulations for Land Use related sections.

Areas that need further discussion at the next meeting:

- Changing and shower facilities
- Green Roofs
- Bicycle Parking
- Heat Island Effect
- Landscaping

Homework:

Review Chapter 5 in the IgCC.

NEXT MEETING

June 2nd – C-TRAC Meeting #3:
3-5:30 p.m. City of Fort Collins Streets Facility