



CONNECTICUT GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL

MINUTES:

Board of Directors Meeting

7 June 2004, 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Location:

Connecticut Innovations, Inc. (Connecticut Clean Energy Fund), Rocky Hill, CT

Attendees:

John Amatruda (JA), Chair
Bryan Garcia (BG), Vice-Chair
Robert Maddox (RM), President
Bruce Bockstael (BB), Vice-President
Richard Barredo (RB), Treasurer
Steve Murphy (SM), Secretary

Paul Antinozzi (PA), Susan Brandes (SB) by telephone, Ken Dreitlein (KD), Frank Gagliardo (FG),
Martin Mador (MM), Michael Smalec (MS), Kim Trella (KT)

Absent:

Doug Disbrow (DD), Debra Lombard (DL), Mike Trolle (MT)

Business Conducted:

1) Call to Order

JA opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. He said he wanted to discuss strategic planning today.

2) Meeting Minutes

There was no discussion of Minutes.

3) Committee Reports – Education

- i. KT asked FG for an update on the recent Tour of NYC green sites. FG said that 25 people took the tour. KT produced a photo essay that will appear on the CTGBC web site. FG said his only regret was that the tour group did not get to see more of Battery Park City. JA asked for an accounting of how many non-members attended. KT and FG reported that the event made “a few hundred dollars” for the CTGBC.
- ii. KT said the next LEED Training might be sponsored by Pfizer, possibly in New London. September 21 or 22 are the possible dates. The new Pfizer laboratory will open in New Haven sometime this Winter. It is anticipated that the facility will achieve a “silver level” green certification. The company has indicated its willingness to conduct a tour of the lab for the CTGBC.

- iii. KT said planning is proceeding for a possible “green hotels” event. She added that the Hotchkiss School in Lakeville and WCSU will hold open houses for their green buildings next Spring. A series of seminars on green building in the residential sector is being put together by the SBIC in conjunction with the Home Builders Association. A grant was obtained to conduct the series. DD may know more about this event.
- iv. KT said the CT Museum for Science and Technology has retained the services of Robert A. M. Stern Associates to help the organization hire an architect for its new facility in Hartford. An RFP is on the street now for prospective firms.
- v. Cynthia Green of the EPA is looking for a list of buildings, by type, in New England.
- vi. MM commented that there is a chance to develop a “green hotel” in New Haven as part of an on-going redevelopment project. He said that Mayor DeStefano wants to do some interesting things.

4) Committee Reports – Membership

MS said the Committee met once this month. It wants member Chris Halpin to be Vice Chair of the Committee. The Committee has a “hot list” of organizations that it has been working with. It includes the AIA, the Construction Institute, the CT Power and Energy Society, CBIA, the Landscape Architects, and the ASHRAE engineers. MS has a draft letter to these groups that he will distribute to Board members for comment. MS said he wants to introduce a “strawman proposal” for corporate dues to the CTGBC. RM agreed, citing the example of a company making a contribution of \$2,500 and getting ten memberships in return. If the level was set at \$1,000, a firm would get x number of memberships. KD commented that our web site is not getting many “hits” lately. There are few requests for information. He noted that membership is down by fifty people. There is a problem with our message. SB agreed, and asked “What do you get for your membership, especially if everything is free?” JA distributed a document entitled *Ideas for Strategic Activities to Attract/Retain Members*. He said the CTGBC needs a basis for providing information. He suggested a possible “members-only” section for the web site. Also, we need a list of professionals with experience doing green projects or offering green services. SB supported JA’s ideas, saying “Let’s do some of these things – be fluid, set a priority on some of the items.” RM said that, in regard to corporate outreach, the Board should start by September with a campaign to increase membership. MM asked if we have to provide information for free. RM said that is how it is done by the USGBC. JA said the CTGBC has to manage the information that goes on the web site. The information has to have substance. Regarding the “members-only” idea, it could have some benefit for specific audiences, e.g., engineers who want access to inside information on something they want to do. But it is better to boost the quality of the web site first. BB said that everything the CTGBC does should bear the web site address. MM said the site needs more content. JA asked for input on the “members-only” section. KD said our webmaster said he could do it. MM reiterated that the Board should address the content upgrade issue today. JA asked “Who do you want to attract -- design professionals since they’ve shown the most interest?” KD said we need a package of things to attract members. PA said he recently did some presentations for green design to local school building committees. He said MM also spoke to the groups. PA called the effort “very effective.” He predicted that it will not be long before the Connecticut legislature writes mandatory legislation for green design. He asked “Should we be a consultant for when that happens?” RM responded that CTGBC members should be hired for such work. BB said CTGBC should advertise the concept, but not push a legislative agenda. KD commented that, if we have information and speakers, we could help prepare people for meetings. This would be something of value to members. It would help them sell their ideas. MM agreed, citing such professional services as energy modeling expertise and building commissioning. PA said that MM had sold this concept in the outreach to school building committees and made it clear he had nothing to gain from it personally. BB said he also speaks to “quality-based committees” of school boards and takes the same approach as PA and MM described, noting that he has nothing to gain from offering information. JA asked if this is a “speakers bureau” function. KM said there is a package on this topic that is “downloadable” from the USGBC. KD said our information has to be unique – something that people must come to us to obtain. MM

added that the information has to be fine-tuned to Connecticut. BB said we need architects and engineers who are pro-active on green issues to be involved. JA suggested that CTGBC should create a managed list of who is certified and available to do this type of work. Our function should be to tell people the key green information. That service will save them time in getting the right answer. PA said the goal is be the source in terms of green products and services. PA said "If we all agree, then how do we do it?" FG brought a job description to the meeting that the Landscape Architects are using to hire someone. FG added that he had asked people on the NYC tour if they would become members of CTGBC (if they weren't already). He said that many said "no", explaining that they pay for their professional societies' dues and don't want to spend more. PA observed that it is tough for individuals to pay, but not so tough for companies. RB said this is why the CTGBC should have both individual and corporate memberships. RM said these things need to be done this summer. JA said that the "members-only" section should show what's available for renewable energy, building codes, green schools, and what the State is doing, for example. MM disagreed, saying that this approach would cut off the general public from access to the information. KD asked if the purpose of these offerings was to raise revenues. If so, he said, there are other ways to do that. JA stated that we want to convince people "why" to do it (green building), and then tell them "how" to do it. KT reminded the Board that we want to hire someone, there's work to be done. She sees the job as a coordinating role. KD asked what we would tell them to do. FG said the person would provide information. KD responded "Specifically, what information?" RM said the Board should look at JA's outline (hand-out), and combine it with the outreach effort that MS is developing. KD called for agreement on what the Board wants to do. KT responded with the example of setting up the speakers bureau – there are tasks that Board members do not have time to do. JA cautioned the Board that the person has to know something about green buildings, too. KT said the person could contact each of us, and pull the information from us.

5) New Business

JA switched the focus of the discussion to MM on another topic. MM said he went to the Kendall Foundation in Massachusetts. Because they know him and his work, the Foundation asked for a proposal on green buildings, especially green schools. MM said the CTGBC is one of several organizations that he would like to work for, if he obtains this funding. This would allow him to provide the CTGBC with the functions that need to be covered. MM said he would request funding sufficient to cover two people. If funding is provided for just one person, it will not be enough to do all that is needed. MM described what he has done for Kendall in the past – green schools and recommendations for legislation on green schools. In CT he would like to assemble a working group of stakeholders soon. This would include people who have something to bring to the table and who have a role to play. He mentioned the "CHiPS" program in California as a possible model. An effort is also underway in Massachusetts to do an adaptation of CHPS. BG said that the CT Clean Energy Fund's sister organization in Massachusetts is starting to do green building work. That group is known as the Massachusetts Energy Trust (MET). MM said the Kendall organization would try to obtain funding from other sources if they cannot supply what the Connecticut proposal needs. Both RM and RB expressed concerns about adding costs to CTGBC. The proposal sounds as though there is more involved than just doing some tasks for us. MM responded that, in the world of non-profit organizations, the employee always has the risk, not the organization. MS said the Board needs to see the proposal. Noting the Board's potential fiduciary responsibility, he suggested putting the item on next month's agenda so the Board can review it. RM asked if the Board thought the idea good enough for MM to spend time drawing up the proposal. He also asked who would be appropriate to submit the proposal to the Kendall Foundation. KD said the proposal should come from the CTGBC. RM said this could easily cost us \$250,000 per year. RB said the Board needs to see more information on this. RM returned to the issue of whether MM should put together a detailed presentation for the Board. MM said he could provide an overview and a list of tasks involved tonight, but other details would have to be heard next week. The Board then went into an Executive Session to discuss the MM proposal. When the Board emerged from the Executive Session, JA said the Board members clearly have separate positions on the matter. JA suggested that MM could submit

his proposal to the Board with one caveat – there can be no lobbying involved in the work. MM asked for JA's definition of lobbying. There followed a discussion of what lobbying entails. RM summarized the discussion by saying there could be no endorsement (or dis-endorsement) of specific pieces of legislation in MM's work plan. It would be cleaner to have the grant focus on green schools information. The cost allocation would get too complicated if lobbying was brought into the picture. It would have the potential for serving two masters. MM said he understood that Boards are for governance and not for doing things. He said there would have to be a crystal clear understanding of what lobbying is and what it is not. RM said to MM that, if he followed through on the proposal, he should do it before July 1st, so the Board can read and review it before the next meeting on July 12th. MM agreed, but requested feedback from Board members before the 12th.

6) Adjourn

There was a motion made to adjourn the meeting. It received a second. The Board members voted to approve the motion.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen D. Murphy