



**Living Building Pilot Technical Advisory Group  
Meeting Summary**

---

<b>Project Number:</b>	3012601
<b>Address:</b>	3400 Stone Way N.
<b>Meeting date:</b>	January 17, 2012
<b>Owner:</b>	Skanska
<b>Architect:</b>	LMN
<b>Mechanical/Energy:</b>	WSP Flack + Kurtz
<b>Technical Advisory Group:</b>	David Walsh, Chris Hellstern, Margaret Sprug, Myer Harrell  (Absent: Tom Nelson, Phoebe Warren, Jon Heller, Mark Frankel, Paul Schwer, Joel Banslaben)
<b>DPD Staff:</b>	Jess Harris, Green Permitting Lead Lisa Rutzick, Senior Land Use Planner

---

The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) is meant to facilitate Living Building projects under Seattle's Living Building Pilot program via peer review of the building's design. The TAG meetings help to identify technical issues that need further analysis, result in better communication to the DRB and foster collaboration on the project.

The development team led by Wendy Pautz-LMN and Tom Marseille- WSP Flack + Kurtz presented details on the design progression, and energy/ water models.

Questions and comments were made by TAG members, staff and the development team. The key issues discussed are paraphrased below.

1. The project will need to remove groundwater from the basement; typically this water is considered wastewater. Diverting this water, treating it, storing it and using it for toilet flushing, irrigation or cooling tower is a worthwhile pursuit, is innovative and meets the intent of the water petal. If it could be used for potable water in the future that would be ideal.
2. Has the de-watering water been tested for toxics? Yes, the water has been tested and no toxins were found. A high iron content was found. If this water were to be used for potable then further study would be needed.
3. Have you looked at using solatubes or something similar to bring light into floorplate? Yes, using devices like solatubes which penetrate the floor plates was evaluated and it was determined they would break up the floor plate too much, making the tenant spaces less usable. The presentation included a study of skylights;” *The impacts of energy savings from skylights were not that significant when taken across the whole building, and there will be additional negative energy impacts from them due to heat losses. However, they do also provide an amenity in the space in the form of natural light penetrations further into the building. If the decision is made to proceed with the skylights, the design will need to be carefully considered to minimize visual discomfort issues while maximizing the energy benefits and the amenity”*
4. Please provide more information on how you plan to address the materials petal? Look towards other local Living Building projects and rely on shared databases created for Oregon Sustainability Center, Bullitt Center and Bertschi School. Skanska has reached out to these other projects with limited success. Skanska was the contractor for Bertschi School so they have some background with this issue.
5. Describe how you have worked with the International Living Futures Institute. If you can work directly with Jason McLennan that is great. Also Eden Bruckman is good to work with during development phase. Amanda Sturgeon typically does not get too involved during development to keep objectivity during compliance. Skanska has met with Jason McLennan.
6. If PV is contemplated then it must be shown on renderings and plans for design review and neighborhood. Yes, that is acknowledged; however, only conceptual plans can be provided during the MUP phase.
7. How are you submetering? Floor by floor? Yes, each floor and special spaces will be submetered.
8. Any particulate testing performed with respect to the transfer station relating to noise, smell, etc.? No testing has been performed.

9. Does floor to floor height impact how chilled beams work? Yes, 12 feet above the floor is ideal, but there is some flexibility.
10. How the project meets the Civilized Environment petal should be presented more clearly. Access to light is critical. Plans show a lot of ground level plaza space and a narrow building which is a good response, but quality of the tenant spaces needs to be linked to civilized environment petal.
11. Staff would like to see a better link between the living building departures and the qualitative or technical issues. It was suggested that a “typical” or baseline floorplate width, height and glazing percentage be used to compare with the proposed, specifically to address daylighting. A comparison like that may help to illustrate the daylighting difference between a narrow floorplate with higher ceiling, optimized glazing, versus a wider floorplate with typical ceiling heights and glazing.