



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Draft SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE

---

Monday, February 9, 2009

4:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 300 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 16 -

Satya V. Rhodes Conway; Judy Compton; William Bremer; Sherrie Gruder; Michael J. Vickerman; Lance T. McGrath; Paul D. Muench; Julia D. Voss; Catherine E. Mackin; David W. Drummond; Garrick R. Maine; David C. Boyer; Lou W. Host-Jablonski; Leslie C. Schroeder; Peter J. Taglia and Marc B. Kornblatt

**Absent:** 2 -

Lance T. McGrath and Paul D. Muench

**Excused:** 1 -

Marc B. Kornblatt

**Others present:** Jeanne Hoffman, Rick Roll, David Trowbridge, Bob McDonald, Brian Grady and Andrew Statz.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Sherrie Gruder asked for a motion to approve the December 8, 2009 minutes. Garrick Maine moved and Judy Compton seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Sherrie Gruder asked for a motion to approve the January 12, 2009 minutes. David Boyer moved and Judy Compton seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

David Knuti (615 West Main Street #301 Madison) came to speak about the redevelopment of the Badger Bus Station. The discussion is about redeveloping of the site for commercial and residential. David feels that this is a bad decision for the City of Madison. This site needs to be looked at as a sustainable issue for the City and is not just a redevelopment. The Badger Bus Company owns this site and they want to redevelop the site and then pick-up bus riders on street corners. There is a thought that the South Union will be a transit hub, which it is not going to be. This will not work well. There are 10 buses at the station at a time, many times during the day.

There are also four transportation plans that the City/region are working on that call for a point of major transit connection – Transport 2020, Midwest Rail System, Connection 2030 Plan and a bus connection in that 2030 plan. There is no better place for a bus station because it is in the city center. The alternatives to this site are congested and not easily developed into a bus center. This site is ideal for bus center. In other cities, there are inter-modal transportation hubs that are seen as a model for the City. I ask that SDE look into this and consider that from a sustainability perspective the current location of the bus station is worth retaining.

Lou Host-Jablonski asked if anyone knows how far along are the plans for redevelopment were?

David Knuti indicated that the developers have hired a design firm, that they went to UDC initially, and have held a large neighborhood meeting about the redevelopment.

Lou Host-Jablonski also asked if staff has looked at the transportation issues?

David Knuti stated that UDC said that the transportation issues are not part of their review. David indicated that he did send information to Mark Olinger who indicated that they would look into this.

Judy Compton asked staff to look into this.

Brad Murphy indicated that there are plans for a 5-story mixed-used commercial/ residential for this site. Brad also indicated that UDC has had an informational presentation on this redevelopment and that there has also been one neighborhood meeting. Staff is aware of this project and is working with the developers. Staff will also be looking for an alternative site for a transit center.

Judy Compton asked if staff has had any conversations with the developer regarding SDE (energy) issues?

Brad Murphy indicated that the discussions with the developer are in the early stages and that staff has not discussed SDE issues yet.

Sherrie Gruder stated that there is no more public comment and closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

## OLD BUSINESS

### 12771

SUBSTITUTE - Establishing sustainability goals to guide the development of the plan for the Northeast Neighborhoods.

Ed Blume (222 S. Hamilton Street, Madison) indicated that he has done some work with Peak Oil and also on the Zoning Code rewrite specifically on issues related to sustainability in the zoning ordinances. Ed asked if this area needs to follow current zoning or does in get to do things differently?

Jeanne Hoffman indicated that yes, the developments will have to follow all ordinances/regulations but that the plan will be the place where staff can recommend additional regulations/incentives if needed to meet these goals.

Karl Van Lith also indicated that the staff report tries to answer some of the questions that committee members brought up at the last meeting.

Brad Murphy went through the staff report for committee members. The intent with the staff report is to provide additional information to the committee given the discussion at the last meeting. The resolution has Sustainability Goals that will inform how the neighborhood plan is written and then adopted by the Common Council.

There are various parts in the plan including implementation strategies on how the goals in this resolution will be met.

The report talks about all the ordinances that are needed to implement development in this area. Staff has not yet identified specific changes to regulations, but the plan may suggest ideas for changes to regulations/ordinances. There is a suggestion of an ordinance change regarding storm water in the staff report. The staff report also talks about how frequently the staff plans to review the plan. Facilities Management staff indicated that Energy Star homes are about 25% below the average energy use of a home in Madison and suggested that there could be an incentive program to award developers that go beyond that.

Staff also suggested a new WHEREAS clause that talks about zero net energy.

Brad emphasized that in the plan there will be implementation strategies on how to meet these goals.

Satya Rhodes-Conway asked about the information in the staff report regarding the average energy use of a home in Madison vs. an Energy Star home. Do you know what is the difference between a home built to current code and Energy Star would be?

Brad Murphy indicated that staff does not have that information available right now, but could work with the utilities to get that type of information.

Satya Rhodes-Conway indicated that that would be good. She further stated that she would like to see these types of goals extended to all planning process in the City. She asked if staff have any plans to do this? She realizes that this is somewhat off topic, but wanted to flag this as something that SDE should talk about in the future.

Brad Murphy indicated that it is staff's intention to try having these goals in the NE Neighborhoods and as we see success, staff can look to use these goals in other neighborhood planning processes.

Judy Compton made a comment that the City needs to make sure that the State and BI know what the City is doing in this area. She stated that we are trying to create a poster child for the State and we want other developments to do this in other areas. She then stated that there would be additional costs that will be passed down to the residents/businesses. She is concerned about this because those people/businesses can go up the road to another city and find similar living/commercial space for cheaper. She wants to know what is the City doing to address this?

Brad Murphy indicated that right now staff and committee members are talking about it and that in the plan staff will be able to get into the details and look at potential ways to mitigate this issue. Brad further stated that there is a marketing advantage of building to these goals and that using less energy and having a better designed home may be something that people/businesses want.

Judy Compton indicated that Veridian can do energy efficiency at little to no cost because Veridian is a developer/builder and they can control costs, but the smaller builders, the ones that buy a lot from a developer can't do what Veridian does. It is these builders that can go up the road and build the home for less (in another community.) Inclusionary zoning failed because the City could not subsidize it. New Urbanism doesn't work because the City doesn't support it. So we need to do the research to find what works and what the City needs to do to make it work.

Michael Vickerman indicated that he drove the area. There isn't anything out there now. He wanted to know what assumptions are being made about the projected population and employment? He also went through Grand View Commons to get to this area. There are only three non-residential uses out there. How is the City going to make sure that this area isn't going to be like everywhere else?

Brad Murphy indicated that the staff does not have time to show the committee all of the background information to explain why this is the area that is being planning for development, but the short answer is that this area was and has been slated for growth since the 1990's because it was shown on the 1990 Peripheral Development Plan. The Comprehensive Plan also indicated that this was slated for growth/development. This led the Plan Commission and Common Council to the recognition that this is a place for development in the future. There isn't a lot of non-residential use right now, but there are groups looking at retail, commercial, office, etc in the area. It is slower to happen because this area does lack Interstate access. Hopefully, we will be able to get transit out there early to help accomplish these goals.

Karl Van Lith reminded committee members that all of these details would come out in the neighborhood plan.

Sherrie Gruder stated that we are right now framing the larger issues/goals so that staff will know how the neighborhood plan should be written.

Judy Compton stated that the interchange was going to be there, but the WisDOT backed off on that idea. There is a business park in the area. The Village of Cottage Grove has an industrial park and they really a focus on getting that industrial park going and now the homes are coming after the businesses. Madison is good at developing plans, but it then takes 20-30 years to see what we want in the plan built.

Lou Host-Jablonski suggested that the committee get on with talking about the goals.

Peter Taglia indicated that there are a lot of innovative ideas that we could look at. He also noted that just because you have an Energy Star home, how you use energy is so important, so having technologies like smart metering etc would be good to look at and we need to explore partnerships with utilities.

Sherrie Gruder added that there are builders, developers, residents, and businesses all responsible for energy use.

Sherrie Gruder then talked about Zero Net Energy. She indicated that SDE has adopted Zero Net Energy and staff has suggested that we add this language in the resolution, so I wanted to talk with the committee about the concept.

This will help the committee answer the question if a 25% reduction is a useful goal or should we should be looking at this differently. A building or a community meets zero net energy if it produces just as much energy as it consumes. A building can be green, but can still use a lot of energy. LEED is better than code there are however, buildings that create as much or more energy than they use and that is a zero net energy building.

With zero net energy buildings, commercial buildings are 60-70% better than code for energy; then the buildings are also creating energy, like PV.

In Austin, TX there is a plan to have all single-family homes be zero-net energy and use 60% less energy by 2030.

Massachusetts is looking into having a policy of zero net energy by 2030.

California is looking at a policy of zero net energy for residential by 2020 and commercial by 2030.

In Alberta, Canada they have a net zero energy development. 90% of the heating is done by a district solar system. Solar hot water systems are installed on each house and large solar PV for the community has also been developed. This is how they heat and power the homes. They also store the solar hot water underground and then use it to heat the homes. There is also a place in England that has district heating, but they use wood. Sherrie showed hot water solar and the heat solar storage concepts.

In California, none of the zero net energy communities have district heating/cooling. The homes are built to 60% better than code; they then also have PV on the home. Sherrie showed a list of ways to make the homes energy efficient. Another California example, the energy bills are 70% less than average and again PV is built right into the mortgage. The expensive counter tops, etc is extra but not the PV.

Sherrie finally showed a couple of places in WI that are zero net energy, including homes and commercial sites.

Sherrie concluded by saying that zero net energy is happening now and she feels that a building that is doing 25% better than code is not that great. Sherrie indicated that Karl Van Lith would facilitate the discussion.

Karl Van Lith suggested that the committee review the resolution and suggested that committee members consider what can SDE do to this resolution to put or stamp on this? The SDE has adopted zero net energy, but the Common Council has not. Are there other things we can do to put our stamp on this?

Andrew Statz indicated that the Water Utility made two additions to the resolution one was to encourage Water Sense and the other was to discourage irrigation of lawns and the LRTPC made changes to the resolution and asked staff to prepare a the plan that includes looking at VMT. Judy Compton asked what that meant.

Brad Murphy indicated that passing this the resolution does not itself restrict water usage. The plan would need to be drafted and adopted by the Common Council. After that there may need to be some changes to our regulations that would also need to be acted on.

Judy Compton wanted to reiterate that the resolution would help frame how the plan will be written. This is for NE neighborhoods not everywhere and this resolution will say what we are going to do.

Karl Van Lith stated again that these are the targets and in the plan there will be the details of how we reach our goals. The SDE would be able to review these plans. Karl made a comment about how Satya Rhodes-Conway suggested that we look at other plans, maybe what SDE needs to do is update the Building a Green Capital City plan? This resolution is a very high level framework that will inform the plan.

Satya Rhodes-Conway asked what the most current version of the resolution is?

Andrew Statz indicated that the Water Utility was working off of the original language and they wanted to add language that would encourage the use of Water Sense and discourage the use of irrigation and LRTPC changes are available to the committee.

Satya Rhodes-Conway suggested that SDE add staff's language regarding zero net energy. She further stated that goals number 2 and number 3; instead of using current citywide average that we use levels if built to current code and that we want to do better than that.

Andrew Statz indicated that the average energy and the 25% reduction is from MGE and that for retro-fits you usually get a 10% return, so the thought was that a 25% improvement would be something that was doable but also a good goal. For water, the Water Utility already has a plan for 20% reduction of water use city wide, so going to 25% for this area is better.

Satya Rhodes-Conway indicated that she did not think that 25% reduction was good enough.

Andrew Statz stated that in talking with developers they thought this would be a goal they could make but it would be hard.

Lou Host-Jablonski asked how does zero net energy and goal #2 work together?

Satya Rhodes-Conway clarified that currently staff is suggesting that the language regarding zero net energy be in the whereas clause of the resolution, so it would not impact the goals at all.

Lou Host-Jablonski then suggested that zero net energy should be a fifth goal because it deals with everything.

Sherrie Gruder suggested that the area be designed to be net zero energy "ready".

Karl Van Lith reminded the committee that zero net energy goals that the committee adopted was for the entire community.

Satya Rhodes-Conway asked if increasing the building code with regard to energy efficiency is one of the things in the Gov. Task Force on Climate Change recommended and asked how does that impact this?

Sherrie Gruder informed the committee that the housing code was just changed.

Michael Vickerman stated that he just finished a white paper on hot water solar. The paper includes information on why hot water solar is good for WI and why WI needs policy to support hot water solar. The only way hot water solar will really be available for people in WI is if we have a better residential code because currently the structures are not strong enough to have hot water solar system on them, so there does need to be a change at the state level so that homes are strong enough.

Karl Van Lith stated that through TNS you ask yourself is it a step in the right direction? Is it flexible? And will we see a return on investment? Staff has indicated that they will review the plan on an on going basis. The resolution provides a target for people to shoot at and keeps these goals on the top of people's minds. This is what we struggle with at the City level too with all of our TNS projects.

Sherrie Gruder stated that this resolution is moving us in the right direction, but she doesn't know if it is flexible. We are designing a new development and if we say yes we want a zero net energy, then how do we get there from where we are now. That planning would be different if we are planning for zero net energy than if we are planning for the goals in this resolution.

Michael Vickerman said, " I know that I am forecasting and not back-casting, but to some extent you need to because the development in this area will be driven by the region and state economy."

Sherrie Gruder stated that the comprehensive plan is done, the neighborhood plan will be written, so the question for the committee is what do we want the goals to be for this area?

Lou Host-Jablonski suggested that we have zero net energy and zero storm water and we need better numbers for traffic.

Satya Rhodes-Conway moved to forward this resolution as amended by LRTPC and Water Utility to the Plan Commission. Peter Taglia seconded the motion.

Satya Rhodes-Conway then amended the resolution to replace goal number two with the following:

"The neighborhood will be a zero net energy community, which means the energy used by the neighborhood equals the amount generated through renewable energy applications."

Lou Host-Jablonski seconded the motion

Michael Vickerman asked if it matters if the energy is created on-site or off-site?

Satya Rhodes-Conway stated that her personal desire would be that wherever possible renewable energy should be made on site.

Peter Taglia suggested keeping some of the language that is still in #2.

Satya Rhodes-Conway – restated the amendment and made some minor changes to deal with committee members' suggestions:

"The neighborhood will be a zero net energy community, which means energy used by the community will equal the amount generated through renewable and/or carbon neutral applications. This can be accomplished through the use of energy efficient construction, on site and/or district renewable and/or carbon neutral energy generation, conservation education and outreach, utility partnerships, or other energy practices."



Lou Host Jablonski seconded the motion.  
The motion passed unanimously.

Lou Host-Jablonski moved that the resolution be changed for goal number 4 to 100%.

Satya seconded the motion.  
The motion passed unanimously.

Lou Host-Jablonski stated for goal number 1 25% of the trips by other modes is not good enough, so how can we look for a better goal. We don't know how to get a baseline.

Bob McDonald indicated that for this area to do better than the downtown will be impossible.

Lou Host-Jablonski moved that the language for goal #1 read:  
“(In comparison to a baseline, based on neighborhoods of comparable density, to be determined by staff),”

Satya Rhodes-Conway seconded the motion

Yes – Sherrie Gruder, Garrick Maine, Cathy Mackin, David Boyer, Peter Taglia, Michael Vickerman, Leslie Schroeder

Abstain – Bill Bremer, Judy Compton

No – David Drummond

Judy Compton moved that the be it finally resolved clause read:  
“Staff will investigate and make recommendations in the final development plan for infrastructure, financial incentives and recognition for encouraging the achievement of these goals.”

Cathy Mackin seconded to motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Sherrie Gruder now asked the committee to vote on the main motion and to approve the resolution as amended tonight.

Judy Compton abstained  
Everyone else approved the motion.

## ADJOURNMENT

Satya Rhodes-Conway made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Michael Vickerman. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.