

CITY OF CALISTOGA
GREEN COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

October 12, 2021 via Zoom at 3:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Committee members present virtually: Chair Antoinette Mailliard, John Gleazer, Millie Pease, and June Knoblich. Staff members present: Zach Tusinger, Samantha Thomas, and Brad Cannon. Vice Chair Kate Stanley joined during Item 4B.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments received. Chair Mailliard requested adding Item 4.D. to the agenda – a discussion to change the regular meeting time as previously requested by Committee member Pease. She mentioned that the meeting end no later than 4:40 pm – 4:30 pm is the Committee’s normal hour and a half time. All items not addressed during this meeting were moved to the next meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Committee member Pease requested one correction to the draft minutes to include inviting Deborah Elliott of the Napa County Certified Green Business Program to present to the Green Committee by the end of the year. The Committee approved draft minutes for the meeting of September 14, 2021, unanimously.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Presentation and Q&A from Brad Cannon, Calistoga Building Official on the Green Building Code.

Chair Mailliard introduced Building Official Brad Cannon and asked Committee members to take up a conversation on the environmental aspects of the building code. She asked if there was a Calistoga Green Code that differs in any way from the State Green Code. Building Official Cannon responded there is not. He explained, through the City’s Municipal Code, the city has adopted the California State California Building Standards Commission’s Codes. Building Official Brad Cannon presented the California Building Code, and specifically the California Green Code (*The California Green Building Standards Code Part 11, of 12 Parts in Title 24, California Code of Regulations*). He went over a brief history of how the green building standards were developed through Executive Order S-20-04 and AB 32, in addition to State agencies working with stakeholders. Building Official Cannon went over the scope and purpose, detailing how it minimizes the impact on the environment and how if it not intended to be a point rated system as well as what it applies to. He explained how the California Green Code is broken up by Divisions and went into detail regarding what is included in each Division. He showed an example of an application checklist for a residential type of project. Committee member Gleazer requested clarification between Tier 1 and Tier 2. Building Official Cannon explained that in the California Green Code, they are simply voluntary measures – addition measures listed in the code. He explained that Calistoga just requires the mandatory measures per the California Green Code, and for more information, one can look on the HCD or the California Building Commission’s website. Building Official Cannon provided a final summary that the California Green Code is an evolving process with implementation of new legislative

mandates with proposed changes in the building codes and standards. Other topics that could be part of the conversation include photovoltaic systems, gray water systems, Reach codes, and SB 1383. The next Building Code cycle comes out on January 1, 2022. He explained that backyard gray water systems are sometimes thrown in to try and save water and more than likely they won't have an impact on cross contamination. He elaborated that this may be one area that the Green Committee could help with via the possibility of facilitating a drive or a push for the community to put in these systems and help with the design.

Committee member Gleazer asked for a background on Reach Codes. Building Official Cannon explained that these codes came out recently with the drive to eliminate our carbon footprint. Specifically, it doesn't allow gas for residences, requiring all electric. The city is currently working on the SB 1383 Organics Diversion Ordinance. Committee member Pease inquired about the difference between a simple and a complex gray water system. Building Official Cannon explained that a simple system would be a sink while a complex system would be engineered. Committee member Knoblich indicated that there are some cities that have already established all electric new buildings, and asked how they're able to do this and we're not? Building Official Cannon explained there was a push at that City because they thought that was the direction they'd like to go – each City has the ability to be more restrictive with the codes and pass ordinances as they see fit – Calistoga just hasn't taken that direction. Chair Mailliard indicated this is direction the State is going. Committee member Gleazer inquired about the possibility of having a combined system, such as a stove. Chair Mailliard elaborated this applies to new construction and new installations. Committee member Gleazer inquired about EV charging stations and if they're each on a separate circuit. Building Official Cannon confirmed. Committee member Gleazer inquired if there's any thought to retrofitting existing multifamily dwellings with EV chargers. Building Official Cannon said certainly and elaborated that a lot of the existing multifamily properties could use an electric service panel upgrade. Committee member Gleazer inquired about electric on demand water as water is wasted just waiting for hot water to get to the sink as well as what VOC stands for. Building Official Cannon indicated there is some recirculation mandates/requirements for that specific reason, but he would need to do further research and that VOC stands for Volatile Organic Compound which is a part of the make-up of the material that off gases. Another gas, hydrofluorocarbon, is present in insulation and may be an interesting topic to dive into at another meeting. The city has seen a lot of closed cell installation applications for new homes or additions – it's an expensive product, but the energy you get, and not having to vent the confined space has a lot of advantages. Some disadvantages are that it does off put some VOCs into the environment. Committee member Gleazer inquired about energy credits for having shade as opposed to having solar panels. Building Official Cannon explained as a part of the applicant's energy compliance documentation, they hire an energy consultant to look at it all, utilizing a program that considers shading components as part of energy savings. Committee member Pease brought up the survey of restaurants the Green Committee conducted with the Chamber where one mentioned they use gray water to landscape. She asked how this would work in a restaurant, and wasn't sure what gray water is? Building Official Cannon responded that gray water entails taking the water that you used in the building and using it on your landscape. The city also has the reclaimed water that they offer and provide. It's likely to be included in the next code cycle where if you build a development and reclaimed water is available, you must use it. Gray water

would include soapy water and is why sometimes the Public Works and the Water Board get nervous. The Committee thanked Building Official Cannon for his time and may invite him back at a future date.

B. Consideration of a Recommendation to the City Council of a Gas-Powered Leaf Blower Ban and Accompanying Action.

Chair Mailliard clarified that the FAQ will not be presented to City Council, so the Committee does not need to discuss these at this time. She suggested the Committee address the ordinance itself and inquired if there were any unresolved questions. Planning and Building Director Tusinger pulled up the ordinance and briefly went over it with the Committee. He noted that the preamble information will get tweaked a bit, but the meat of the item is the code language. He noted that Committee member Gleazer did a great job putting together an initial draft, basing it largely on Yountville's ordinance. The ordinance is based on both Yountville's and Sonoma's ordinances and is technical which is why there will be an FAQ and outreach to follow this by the Committee. Director Tusinger asked that in addition to any comments on the actual code language, the one thing that would be helpful from the Committee is how are the incentives or rebate programs going to look. He showed the application forms from Yountville, a residential and a commercial form, which indicated residents would receive a \$125 to \$150 rebate depending on the type of leaf blower, while commercial is based on more of a sliding scale depending on the number of properties maintained.

Chair Mailliard indicated she's hesitant on the total ban for Sundays in order to allow for residential use. She presented this for a brief discussion with Committee members. Committee member Gleazer stated he prefers to keep the leaf blower ban on Sunday's. Committee member Pease inquired where the ordinance states a violators offence and the current situation on Sunday's. Director Tusinger explained how nuisances work under the municipal code and would be handled like other public nuisances. The City's current situation for Sunday's entails the prohibition of commercial construction. Committee member Pease thought it be best to include hours on Sunday's as well. Director Tusinger explained that on the commercial side, staff recommends that those applying for a rebate would need to be a licensed business in Calistoga, which is a requirement when working on yards in the city. He further elaborated that a business license for a gardening business is under \$100 and is an annual fee. Committee member Knoblich asked who would be enforcing the ordinance. Director Tusinger explained it would be city staff, and that since Calistoga has a small staff, the city operates largely on a complaint basis. If staff is out and they see someone doing something in violation of the ordinance we try to educate them first, trying to get compliance through education. Committee member Stanley indicated she would like to keep Sunday's quiet as well. Committee member Pease indicated she would like to see the commercial rebate at \$500 and indicated that perhaps a note could be made to City Council that if they have excess funds this year before it gets enacted, the Committee would like to make the rebate \$500. Committee member Gleazer indicated that he agreed with Committee member Pease. He further elaborated that the electric equivalent to a professional gas-powered leaf blower can be over \$1,000.

Director Tusinger requested a recommendation from the Committee regarding a tiered approach for the rebate program. Chair Mailliard indicated that if it's not tiered, then the question is, is the company really doing gardening in Calistoga and would the rebate be for one leaf blower or can they come back for additional? She further

explained that there should some sort of a ceiling and could take the form of a tiered program that maxes at a certain amount or can take the form of a flat amount per leaf blower with a ceiling – it just can't be open ended. Director Tusinger recommended polling the Committee on where they stand on Sunday or no Sunday use of leaf blowers. The Committee voted 3-2 to have some sort of a carve out on Sundays to allow the use of leaf blowers from 12 pm to 4 pm. Director Tusinger recommended revisiting the outreach aspect assuming Council approves the ordinance. Chair Mailliard indicated that the Committee has an outreach framework, but the Committee still needs to refine them. Chair Mailliard asked for a final vote from the Committee to revise the ordinance to allowed leaf blowers on Sunday's from 12 pm to 4pm and to specify how to structure the rebate. Committee members voted 3-2 in favor, with a unanimous vote 5-0 to recommend the revised ordinance to Council. Director Tusinger thanked the Committee members for their efforts with this ordinance, specifically Committee member Gleazer. Committee member Pease moved to adopt the tiered rebates as seem from Yountville. Committee member Gleazer indicated the amounts for commercial is too low and that businesses with 1 to 3 accounts should receive \$300 and those with 4 or more should receive \$500. Chair Mailliard agreed. Committee member Gleazer moved to recommend the proposed rebate amounts with a second from Committee member Stanley. After a roll call vote, the item carried successfully 5-0. Director Tusinger communicated to the Committee that this item will go to Council sometime in November.

C. Consideration of Rules of Procedure for the Green Committee.

Chair Mailliard indicated no additional potential rules for the Committee were received and that staff has prepared a list of rules that covers the basics for the Committee to review. Director Tusinger briefly went over the rules as proposed. Committee member Millie indicated she believes this is a great idea and good to have it in writing/clarified. Chair Mailliard second. Chair Mailliard moved to adopt the rules of procedure for the Green Committee as written. Committee member Gleazer seconded the motion. After a roll call vote, the item carried successfully 5-0.

D. Proposed Meeting Time Change.

Chair Mailliard introduced the request from Committee member Pease that the committee change the meetings start time from 3 pm to 2:30 pm, with the underlying goal of having longer meetings. Committee member Pease explained the time change would be most beneficial when meetings include a presentation to allow enough discussion amongst Committee members. Chair Mailliard polled the Committee and only one member indicated they would like the meeting to be at an earlier start time and therefore tabled the item until it's brought up again at a later date.

5. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' IDEAS & REQUESTS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

Committee members expressed interest in having Building Official Brad Cannon come back. Committee member Pease requested staff to assist with scheduling Deborah Elliott of the Napa County Certified Green Business Program to present at the next meeting. Committee member Gleazer brought up residents' interests in having the Napa County Fairgrounds owned and operated by the city itself. He indicated he believes the Green Committee should weigh in on the property as it has relevant aspects as far as climate change, etc. He suggested further discussion on this topic. Chair Mailliard recommended bringing this up during goal setting for 2022 and invite a well-informed speaker to talk about this subject matter. Committee member Gleazer requested to discuss this recommendation with the Friends of Napa County

Fairgrounds – the Committee had no objections. Committee member Pease recommended Committee members take a tour of the Up Valley Dump and Recycling Center and to pick up the packets at City Hall’s front counter. Committee member Stanley requested confirmation from Chair Mailliard that the next meeting would entail discussing items the Committee wants to focus on. Director Tusinger confirmed with Chair Mailliard that the next Committee meeting would include goal setting for 2022. Chair Mailliard indicated that the goal setting discussion may need to occur over multiple meetings due to potential presentations. Committee member Stanley expressed this is important to discuss what the Committees’ goals are before speakers come. Chair Mailliard clarified the Committee will set a handful of top priorities with the understanding that additional items may come up throughout the year for the Committee to address. For his last meeting, the Committee thanked Director Tusinger for all of his work with the Green Committee.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:40 p.m.