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## Advisory Committee Meeting Draft Summary

## October 24, 2017

## Agenda & Committee Member List (See attached)

## Attendance

Gary Myers Washington Department of Ecology

Amy Waterman Seattle 2030

Jessica Knickerbocker City of Tacoma

Heidi Siegelbaum WSU Stormwater Center

Mindy Roberts Washington Environmental Council

Pam Emerson City of Seattle

Vince McGowan Washington Department of Ecology

Erika Harris Puget Sound Regional Council

Peg Staeheli Mig/SvR

Micki McNaughton Aborea

Jessie Israel The Nature Conservancy

Linden Lampman Washington Department of Natural Resources

Heather Ballash Washington Department of Commerce

Linda Bentley Washington Department of Commerce

Charlene Andrade Washington Department of Commerce

## Project Description

Erika and Heather explained that the goal of the project is to encourage incorporating green infrastructure into urban centers to make them more healthy and attractive. The project will be focused on PSRC’s regional growth centers (map attached and at: <https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/centers_small_0.pdf> ). Erika and Heather said the project hopes to provide a tool box of incentives that local governments could offer to private developers if they include green infrastructure in redevelopment projects in urban areas when the permit would not normally require it.

## Committee Discussion:

The Committee then spent some time discussing ideas for focusing the project and discussed barriers and incentives. The following summarizes the general discussion:

The intersection of land use and stormwater is a pinch point for municipalities. We need to span that pinch point of what is required and what would be better to do to be prepared for the future. Space for green infrastructure in urban centers is limited. Developers have to include sidewalks. Space needs to be discussed as part of this project. It is not as simple as “incentives”. It is a “take” issue. And there is a challenge with local government providing incentives because they cannot really give money under the state constitution. We need to be clear at a policy level before we get to social marketing.

Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) is more than low impact development (LID). It’s not just land use. What you can do on the land (regulations), and what you do to mitigate it. They are related, but are in different buckets. If that is the case, then we are talking about both buckets. GSI and LID benefits are measured differently, and success factors for a project are different.

Based on polling that The Nature Conservancy did, people prefer the term “nature-based solutions” rather than green infrastructure. And they prefer “rain” to “stormwater”.

Other barriers are the availability of geotechnical information and the requirement for monitoring for a year. The data level varies between and within jurisdictions and between new and upgrading existing sites.

Sustainability and environmental justice must be addressed or this project will fail. We must address the affordability and displacement risks. We must be inclusive. Community groups are recognized as an important focus group for implementing these types of projects as much as developers and municipalities. Some recommended addressing barriers and incentives to community groups, as well as including a diversity of community groups on the advisory committee and in the social marketing study.

Transportation folks need to be included in the group.

We need tailored approaches for different sized jurisdictions, different locations, and maybe different economic situations.

Are we talking about future development or righting past wrongs? Are we looking forward or back? We need to be clear about the distinction. The Nature Conservancy is designing a methodology to interview Phase I and Phase II jurisdictions regarding how they design green infrastructure. They are collecting stories of innovation. In looking at the regional growth center map, it was noted that it is interesting what isn’t in the regional growth centers that could be protected. In response, another commenter stated that they are not sure the urban growth area has been successful because things have not gotten better. However, the subarea plan for the Tacoma Mall regional growth center is a good success story and will provide for green infrastructure retrofits in an existing neighborhood. And, the Northgate Mall retrofit of the parking lot was totally incentivized. Technical assistance was the incentive. The developer didn’t lose any uses of the property. The City was able to make the business case for it. The developer voluntarily righted a past wrong.

Another source of information that could be useful are data layers regarding pollutant loading from stormwater for maps. King County has been mapped.

## Key questions/messages:

* Looking forward versus backward (new vs. old development) in providing incentives
* Land use (growth) versus regulatory mitigation (NPDES)
* Denser communities versus single family residential
* Bigger jurisdictions versus smaller
* Who’s our audience– cities, developers, general public (with the caveat that need to be careful about lumping all in the “general public”)
* Large conceptual project vs. location-based tailored approach (and what areas)
* People benefits vs. water quality and runoff benefits
* Recovery of water quality vs. good cities
* Property fix vs. community fix

Green infrastructure should be promoted even in areas where permits are not required and for other reasons than water quality, such as for healthy communities.

What is success? Is it Puget Sound recovery or healthy communities? We should invest in the most cost effective places. The cost of retrofitting everywhere is prohibitive. So we must prioritize for the most cost effective (lowest cost point in time) projects with the most benefit.

How do we attract innovators and early adopters? We need to know that before we decide how to answer the key questions. What are the commonalities among innovators – what inspires them? There is lots of research on this. And how do we get from innovators to early adopters?

Developers’ first question of this project will be why do it? The second question will be who benefits? Who benefits statements need to be in the why.

It was agreed that the discussion may be expanding the scope. We need to make sure we stay focused for purposes of this project. We need to be explicit about what we want in the “social marketing study”. It should be social research on barriers and incentives. It was agreed that we need to have another meeting in a month to narrow and define the scope.

We should reach out to the Green Infrastructure Exchange. Need to network to get this going. There are studies all over the country.

The Nature Conservancy is working with Denny Heck and Derek Kilmer to create federal incentives for green infrastructure. They will have a listening session in Tacoma in November.

## Social Marketing Study

The project will employ social marketing to understand impediments and to identify incentives for changing behaviors for increasing LID. Some noted that we may need to decide who is the target change audience here (developers, municipalities, communities, and localities) before social marketing can help. Heidi Siegelbaum made a presentation on Social Marketing (see attached). It will also be posted on the web site with the meeting agenda and summary.

## Literature Search

Linda Bentley talked about the literature search efforts that will be posted at [www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias\_\_1965/37121/default.aspx](http://www.ezview.wa.gov/site/alias__1965/37121/default.aspx)
Next steps

* Commerce will do a doodle poll and schedule another meeting in about a month.
* The next meeting will focus on narrowing the scope of the project. We may bring in speakers from each of the audience sectors.

## Requests for Committee members:

* Suggestion for speakers for next meeting (needed within the week).
* Case Examples of successes or impediments (needed over next few months).
* Literature on social marketing associated with doing this type of work with developers, municipalities and/or community groups (needed by Dec 31).
* Suggestions for other advisory committee members from transportation, developers, and possibly community groups.

# **Building Green Cities**

# **Advisory Committee Kickoff Meeting**

October 24, 2017 10:00 am - 12:30pm

Puget Sound Regional Council Offices

Waterfront Place Building, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA

Directions & Transportation information: <https://www.psrc.org/contact-center/directions>

Light Refreshments will be served

## Welcome Charlene Andrade 10:00 - 10:20

Review Agenda, Meeting Goals & Objectives

## Advisory Committee Introductions Charlene Andrade 10:20 - 10:50

## Project Goals & Committee Participation Heather Ballash & Erika Harris 10:50 – 11:30

Project Elements, Committee Participation, Timelines, Products

## Social Marketing Presentation/Discussion 11:30 – 12:00

“Selling Green Cities: a Model for Persuasion”
Heidi Siegelbaum, Washington State University, Stormwater Center

## Literature Review Linda Bentley 12:00 – 12:10

## Next Steps Charlene Andrade 12:10 – 12:30

# Building Green CitiesAdvisory Committee

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mindy Roberts  |  | Washington Environmental Council |
| Paul Crane |  | City of Everett |
| Peg Staheli |  | MIG/SvR Consulting |
| Micki McNaughton |  | Consulting |
| Heidi Siegelbaum |  | Washington Stormwater Center, Washington State University |
| Vince McGowan |  | Washington Department of Ecology |
| Chris Wierzbicki |  | FutureWise |
| Jessie Israel |  | The Nature Conservancy |
| Erika Harris |  | Puget Sound Regional Council |
| Dave Ward |  | Kitsap County |
| John Palmer |  | Environmental Protection Agency |
| Linden Lampman/Ben Thompson |  | Washington Department of Natural Resources |

