



## CONNECTICUT GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL

### MINUTES:

#### **Board of Directors Meeting**

13 September 2004, 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

#### **Location:**

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

#### **Attendees:**

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

Susan Brandes (SB), Doug Disbrow (DD), Frank Gagliardo (FG), Debra Lombard (DL), Michael Smalec (MS), Kim Trella (KT), Mike Trolle (MT)

#### **Absent:**

John Amatruda (JA) Chair, Paul Antinozzi (PA), Ken Dreitlein (KD)

### **Business Conducted:**

#### **1) Call to Order**

BG waited for a quorum before opening the meeting. He opened the meeting at 4:17 p.m., when a sufficient number of Directors had arrived.

#### **2) Meeting Minutes**

SM said he had distributed the May, 2004 meeting Minutes for consideration today. He indicated the June Minutes had been sent to Directors just prior to today's meeting. RM made a motion to approve the May Minutes, and his motion received a second from DD. The Board voted unanimously to approve the May Minutes. MS noted that, in the June Minutes, there was a reference to the Membership Committee. He said it should be cited as the Membership/Marketing Committee instead. BB made a motion to adopt the June Minutes, as corrected. RB gave a second to the motion. The June Minutes, as corrected, were approved unanimously by the Board.

#### **3) Committee Reports - Education**

KT reported the following: NESEA is sponsoring a solar homes tour; the upcoming LEED training session at Pfizer is sold out (75 registrations); the Committee is trying to get higher education people interested in green building, e.g., Yale, UCONN. RM suggests that CTGBC hold three or four "dinner meetings" per year

at which expert speakers would appear. It would represent a service to current members and also be a way to increase membership. RB cautioned that such events should be budgeted for no more than \$500 each. RM said he hoped to break even on the dinners. MS said other groups do these events, too. There was discussion of where to hold the dinners in the area. RB made a motion to go ahead with the idea of holding dinner meetings. SB gave the motion a second. The Board agreed to go forward with the motion. SB suggested calling the first meeting "October membership event." It was tentatively scheduled for October 28<sup>th</sup>. KT continued with her list of upcoming events: January, 2005 tour of Pfizer Lab in New Haven; tour of Hotchkiss School in the Spring; tour of Western CT State University Science Building in the Spring. On October 5<sup>th</sup>, *Rebuild America* is sponsoring a symposium on high performance schools at Rensselaer -- Hartford. Both JA and DD will make presentations. DD asked for information and pictures concerning CT projects. SB said Glastonbury is thinking of doing a design for its high school. FG said *The Hartford Courant* did a story on the proposed CT Science Center. There will be a display of the finalists' architectural models at the Bushnell next week. FG asked if we would comment as a group or individually. BB said we should see if the projects are going to be sustainable. RM suggested that we should not say one model is better than another. Rather, we should comment on the RFP content. BG said the Clean Energy Fund had provided input to the RFP. DL said the design competition is precedent-setting. "What better way for CTGBC to be involved? The project should address [sustainable] issues. Our review could be used for other projects in the future," she said. BG said that the Science Center's Board had voted to make the project green. DL asked if CTGBC would compile comments. SB suggested looking at the RFP first and then sending a letter with an offer to help. DL asked who would do what. KT said the CTGBC is not a review board. RM said we could give tips, tell them about our members. SB said we should make them aware of what we can offer. DL said we should do more than just steering resources -- for example, offer something more substantial based on our experience. BG commented that the Dean of the School of Architecture at Yale is on the Science Center's Board to organize the building effort. RB asked DL if she was proposing a design team approach for us. DL responded that Massachusetts has developed a protocol for how to hire a green architect. RB said we should share that information with the Science Center's developers, give them a list of our members' services, link them to other organizations such as CHPS or MET. DL said we should review the Center's approach. SB said our role should be to make everyone on the Science Center's Board knowledgeable about green buildings. DL said that was not what she meant. BG said we should look at the RFP first. DL explained that the design competition should be treated as an event, to draw out something more useful from what the CTGBC does. SB asked DL to flesh out this concept some more. BG said he would distribute the RFP tomorrow. He asked for comments to come back to him by the end of the week, thereby enabling him to send out a letter to the Science Center next week.

#### 4) **Committee Reports – Marketing/Membership**

MS said he developed a "straw-man" proposal on corporate dues. He also drafted a letter to send to other organizations, as well as a list of organizations to receive it. RM asked if the Board wanted to have corporate sponsors. He said "If so, let's do it now. I'd like to start approaching firms." MS suggested tabling the issue until the next committee meeting. RM disagreed, saying that "there are a lot of issues hanging out there." He said he wanted to know whether he should put something regarding corporate support on the web site or not. RB said there is consensus to do corporate sponsorships, but the idea needs a little fine tuning. RM said he wanted to start approaching corporations now, with three levels of sponsorship a possibility (\$2,500, \$1,000, \$500/250) and showing what the sponsor would get in return. SB asked what the differential between a \$100 individual membership and a more substantial corporate sponsorship would get a sponsor. RM responded that this is similar to what our colleagues in Cleveland did -- it will tell us what kind of budget we'll have for the year and allow for different levels of programming. MS asked RM to repeat the categories. RM said a sponsorship of \$2,500 would get the sponsor four individual memberships, \$1,000 would get them two

memberships and \$500 or \$250 would get them one membership. SB said that is great for the CTGBC, but wondered what companies would think the advantages of such an arrangement would entail. DL pointed out that, out of the current membership of 75 or so, only three firms have more than one member of CTGBC. MS said allowing corporate memberships is a compromise position for us. DL said that, if a corporation wants to provide \$2,500 and get four votes on things, there are downsides to this. RB said his concern is how many times can we “go back to the well” in a year with our supporters. He thought it might be easier to ask for \$2,500 in one shot. RM said the Cleveland organization’s levels are much higher. RB said he would recommend sponsorship levels at \$2,500 (with four memberships), \$1,000 (with three memberships), and \$250 (with two memberships). He said we have to show a difference between an individual membership and corporate sponsorship. BG asked if there was a motion to go forward with RM’s concept. There followed much discussion. Finally, RB made a motion to adopt the following structure: \$2,500 platinum level (four memberships), \$1,000 gold level (three memberships), and \$350 silver level (two memberships). KT gave a second to the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion. After the vote SB asked what would be done to market this program. RM responded that the first thing would be to improve the web site and then to stress to potential sponsors that they could have their company logo on it. MS asked to focus the discussion on the web site. RM requested that everyone send as much new material as possible, especially pictures, to our webmaster, Dan Rothenberg. RM asked if he could be authorized to spend up to \$1,000 to have the webmaster do the improvements. RB wondered if the work was covered under Mr. Rothenberg’s existing contract. RM said he thought that this work would likely exceed the current contract limit, but not by very much. RM added that the webmaster might spend time doing additional photography on location. DD asked how much would be needed to fund the work if photography was left out, although he admitted that it’s very important to have quality pictures on display. DD added that costs could be avoided if Board members supplied the photos. RM said most of the work time would be spent developing content. DL suggested that the web site have a cross-section of a green building. BG said that ultimately State agencies would be able to make updates of projects on the web site. RM made a motion to authorize up to \$1,000 more than the current contract with Yankee Planning to have Dan Rothenberg upgrade the web site. RB interjected that “we’ve paid him \$3,550 so far this year.” He suggested that RM talk to KD who has a copy of the contract. RB asked “How much of this \$3,550 has been allocated to do this work?” BG asked if extra money would be needed in order for the upgrade to be done. RM responded affirmatively. MS made a motion that the \$1,000 be authorized for the web site upgrade, contingent on RM going through KD for “contract compliance.” SB gave a second to the motion. All Board members present voted in favor of the motion.

RM said that potential participants in our “speakers’ bureau” could not charge a fee for their appearances. SB asked why not. BG interrupted the discussion and asked that it be put off to next month in order to get to other items on today’s agenda. BB said speakers have to be restricted to talking just about green buildings. DD said there needs to be a review of speakers’ qualifications. BG then turned the Board’s attention to the annual election of Board members. RB said he needed to report to the Secretary the number of bona fide members of CTGBC as of a date certain. Effective today, there are sixty-seven such members, he said. RM thought the proper date was October 1<sup>st</sup>. SB looked through the By-Laws for clarification. Finding nothing in the By-Laws, RB set the date as September 15<sup>th</sup>. Next, BG raised the issue of the proposal to the Kendall Foundation and MM’s work on the proposal. KT noted that the draft proposal she received from BG today was exactly the same as it was before – she saw no changes by MM per the sub-committee’s suggestions. BG said he and KD would be meeting soon with the Kendall people. RM said that the recent Langdon Report (?) had found that doing LEED buildings does not result in increased costs compared to conventional building design and construction. KT said MM’s proposal is inaccurate. DD said he thought MM was going to revise it. RM said MM should be told that the proposal is ok now, but it needs more work. DD said the proposal situation “needs to be managed.” The meeting with Kendall is next week. JA will send a memo to MM about

the scope of services for his work on the project. Everyone needs to see it. SM reviewed the highlights of the MM proposal from the July meeting. BG said that outreach to stakeholders along with a presentation to legislators, preparation of a "white paper", and coordination of effort are the three things that CTGBC wants from the project.

RM asked if a motion was needed to establish a specific date for the list of members in good standing who could vote in our election. It was agreed that the Board could set any date it wants since no date is mentioned in the By-Laws. RM made a motion to follow RB's suggestion to set September 15<sup>th</sup> as the effective date. SB gave a second to the motion. All Board members present voted in favor of the motion. DL said she still wanted the Board to discuss storm water guidelines. BG said that discussion would have to take place next month. BG said the Kendall people would be coming to Connecticut next week to do some "fact-finding." BB and KT said they wanted to be involved in that meeting.

**5) Adjourn**

There was a motion by RM to adjourn the meeting. MS and DD gave it a second. The Board members voted to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Stephen D. Murphy