



Ketchum Sustainable Building Code Team

Meeting Minutes 1/8/13

Attendees:

Green Team: Rebecca Bundy, Cedric Knehans, Steve Kearns, Glen Carsten, Joe Marx

Bigwood Bread Team: Dave Wilson, Buffalo Rixon, Stephan Wasilewski, Brandon Crego, George Golleher

- Approved minutes from: November 27, 2012 and October 30, 2012.
- Discussed with Bigwood Bread team their interest in acting as a test case for the IgCC with the goal of receiving a green certification from the City:
 - Dave Wilson commented that a points system would work better than having mandatory requirements. It would allow for more flexibility and would reward projects that go beyond the minimum. The level of achievement can serve as a marketing tool for a project.
 - The Green Team noted that this is a good idea, but that it could be problematic, since the IgCC is intended to be mandatory. However, going beyond the minimum requirements with “project electives” could be awarded with a higher status.
 - Buffalo has looked through the IgCC and, outside of water conservation, found that Chapter 4 was the most difficult to satisfy. He found four areas of the Bigwood Bread Bakery project that would require some change or further research in order to meet the code:
 - Employee shower
 - 50% of bicycle racks covered by a roof
 - Daylighting
 - Hardscape (parking lot)
 - Documentation is seen as the greatest hurdle – Buffalo mentioned the topsoil documentation requirements of Chapter 4. The Green Team has not yet examined Chapter 4 in detail and will consider this input when they do.
 - The Bigwood Bread Team asked that the Green Team consider the different requirements of different types of uses in reviewing the code (i.e. hotel vs church).
 - The entire group felt that having the Bigwood Bread project act as a commercial green building test case could benefit both parties. The Bigwood Bread team can help to determine what portions of the IgCC make sense for Ketchum, and the City can award their project some sort of green recognition for their efforts (i.e. an actual certification or an award for their efforts).
 - The Green Team will consider making some items mandatory and developing a system for rewarding compliance with additional items.
 - The Bigwood Bread team then left the meeting, so the Green Team could continue their code evaluation.

- Resource Efficiency chapter:
 - Section 505 – 55%. ASTM – steel. Mike spoke with Sawtooth Construction about availability of recycled content steel. It is readily available for recycled content and recyclability.
 - Section 506 – Mike checked with Stoops about low mercury lamp availability. They are readily available, and there is no up charge.
- Water Efficiency chapter
 - Section 702.8 – Tough to meet. Distances can be too great. Glen contacted Bob Ticker, mechanical engineer in Boise, but does not yet have needed information.
 - Section 703.5 – Heat exchanger. No code allows once-through. Need to consider metering requirement.
 - Section 704 – Rebecca will continue to research.
 - Section 705 – Rebecca will check with water department (Pat Cooley has been unavailable over the holidays.). Do they have the capability to do remote and daily data? For new construction, it would not be a hardship to require smart meters.
- Indoor Environmental Quality chapter
 - Section 801 – Yes. Engineer should spec.
 - Section 802 – Yes.
 - Section 803 – Yes.
 - Section 804 –
 - 804.1 – Yes.
 - 804.2 – do more research on cost and availability of 3rd party tester. Might want to make optional.
 - Section 805 – Yes.
 - Section 806 – Yes. Rebecca googled a variety of products and found that the requirements are generally reasonable.
 - Section 807 – Yes. Steve remarked that he and Mike Doty are doing exactly these requirements for the Cold Springs Crossing project. They are not onerous and result in a product where noise doesn't transfer between units.
 - Section 808 – Formulas look daunting, but diagrams are helpful. Get with Mike Doty to see what he thinks.
- Compare with LEED requirements – Rebecca will talk with Preston Ziegler, Sawtooth Construction, about how IgCC compares with LEED NC.
- 2009 IECC - Hailey requires 10% better performance than 2009 IECC. COMCheck calc or performance path. At the classes Rebecca took at the ICC convention, they recommended using the IECC or Chapter6, not both. The Team decided to start by aligning with Hailey's 10% better requirement.

Tasks to complete before next meeting:

- Compare 2009 IECC and Chapter 6 to see if any of the additional requirements of Chapter 6 should be included in the adopted code.
- Think about how we could configure a minimum certification with optional higher compliance levels.

Next meetings:

- Tuesday, January 29, 2013, 4:00 pm (Please note – not Jan. 22.)
- Tuesday, February 26, 2013, 4:00 pm