

**Alternative Technology Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes – January 8, 2009**

Committee members in attendance: Aron Faegre, Ron Hays, Joshua Klyber, Edward Vranizan, Peter Dusicka, Samir Mokashi

BDS Staff: Andy Peterson, Terry Whitehill, Debbie Cleek

Not present: Kathy Bash, Hank McDonald (BDS)

1. **Introductions:** The meeting began with each of the committee members introducing themselves and briefly describing their interest in the work of the committee. Each committee member was notarized and sworn in.
2. **Election of Officers:** The committee voted to have Edward Vranizan serve as the committee chair and Samir Mokashi to serve as the vice-chair.
3. **Term Limits:** The committee members each drew numbers to determine what the length of their first term would be (to assure that the entire committee would not turn over at the same time.) The term limits were set as followed:
 - One-year term: Aron Faegre & Kathy Bash
 - Two-year term: Edward Vranizan & Peter Dusicka
 - Three-year term: Joshua Klyber, Ron Hays, Samir Mokashi
4. **Approval of by-laws:** There was a brief discussion about committee members assisting applicants in preparing their applications – by helping them figure out where to find resources and what to submit - as a way of encouraging them to use the process. It was decided that this should be allowed, but did not need to be discussed in the by-laws. In these instances it would be up to the individual committee member to determine if their help created a conflict of interest, and excuse themselves from the discussion/voting. The committee approved the bylaws as written.
5. **Overview of where we are at:** Debbie indicated that BDS had not yet received any applications although she had done extensive outreach to local organizations and the media. One concern was that the AIA and the Cascadia Green Building Council had not responded to her request to get information out to their members. Samir said that he could work with her to reach the AIA.

The group discussed whether the lack of applications was a result of the economy, or a lack of knowledge about the process. It was decided that the best way to generate interest in the process would be to get some technologies through the review as soon as possible – which would provide a tangible example to the public of how the process works.

It was discussed whether BDS can select some technologies they have been having difficulties approving and run them through the process themselves. It was decided that this might represent a conflict of interest for BDS. In addition, it would be ideal to have an actual applicant/advocate representing the technology.

The committee members discussed the idea of one of them serving as the applicant for a technology that the group agreed they wanted to review. BDS stated that they could probably waive the \$150 review fee for such an application. The committee members brainstormed various technologies that would be good candidates. They agreed that they would contact their resources and try to find an applicant that could bring in an application by no later than the March meeting.

The meeting concluded with the group discussing the idea of visiting the structural testing lab at PSU in February if there were no applications to review by that meeting.