



CLIMATE SMART  
MISSOULA

# Building(s) for the Future

## 2021 Findings Report

*DRAFT* May 2021

Climate Smart Missoula  
Caroline Lauer and Amy Cilimburg



# Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....2

Introduction.....3  
    ACEEE Technical Assistance

Overview of January 2021 Summit.....4  
    Panel and Breakout Groups  
    TABLE 1. Foundational and Primary Strategies

Findings and Next Steps.....10

Work Plan Table - Spring 2021-2022.....13

Appendices (to accompany this report)  
    Appendix A. Compiled List of Strategies  
    Appendix B. Compiled Background Briefs  
    Appendix C. ACEEE Memo  
    Appendix D. ACEEE Appendices

## Executive Summary

Building(s) for the Future is a collaborative initiative led by Climate Smart Missoula, Missoula County, and the City of Missoula, with the involvement and support of myriad community partners. Together we seek to accelerate the adoption of low-carbon building techniques and retrofits of existing buildings in order to address climate change while making buildings safer, more comfortable, and more affordable. This means intentionally considering climate and energy as we plan, build, operate and deconstruct buildings within our community.

Over the course of the last 1.5 years, Climate Smart Missoula has spearheaded efforts to understand the opportunities for decarbonizing our building stock, and via extensive research and community engagement, have developed this Findings Report, featuring an array of strategies and opportunities relevant to the Missoula area that can be adopted over the next one to ten years.

2021 is bringing increasing attention to the need to think and act differently to build a climate smart future. The impacts of climate change and extreme weather are increasingly being felt, from longer wildfire and wildfire smoke seasons, to extreme and costly storms that impact infrastructure, to expensive utility bills that make housing increasingly unaffordable. Local

governments are increasingly stepping up to better prepare, collaborating with local and regional partners and aligning efforts with federal government priority action plans. This Findings Report should help guide our local approach and activities.

### **Our process**

Partners sought input from an invited Task Force (see Introduction) and together this 13-person team determined a strategic direction to educate and bring our community together. The National League of Cities and the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) provided guidance and support for this Building(s) for the Future work to date. Climate Smart researched what other cities are doing and which of those options would fit Missoula. ACEEE provided a swath of additional options to consider, as well as resources for how we could begin to evaluate their greenhouse gas reduction potential and cost to implement. We developed a full “menu of options” that analyzed implementation levers, feasibility, costs, and benefits. In fact, our team approached the effort from this frame: our community is presented with a locally relevant and detailed dinner menu, and it’s time to choose what is most appetizing!

Through our deep dive into the myriad options available to mid-size communities like ours and via public and expert input, we have four overarching goals for low-carbon building in our community:

- Generate excitement and enthusiasm for a culture of low-carbon building via the ACEEE scorecard or other goals
- Adopt local policy by the spring of 2022 and create a phased policy approach extending to 2030
- Expand existing resources and capacity
- Foster connections and pursue collaborative opportunities.

We acknowledge that the goals and strategies described herein are best considered in the larger context of forward-thinking land use planning, development that focuses inward to reduce sprawl and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, and other sustainable approaches and goals for the City and County. Additionally, via Home ReSource, there are additional efforts to advance deconstruction, material reuse, and building for eventual next life that complement this Findings Report.

This effort can best be advanced by public-private partnerships, dedicated resources from local government, and, hopefully, funding support given the new direction of the federal administration or from other funding opportunities. There is tremendous potential for improved health outcomes, economic development, and climate action within our building stock, and we are excited to get busy.

# Introduction

Building(s) for the Future is a joint effort led by Climate Smart Missoula and between Missoula County, the City of Missoula, and Climate Smart Missoula. Initiated in late 2019, the driving goal is to understand the opportunities for decarbonizing our building stock, considering materials and energy use in new construction and retrofits. In a nutshell it means building for a climate smart future with design, construction, operation and deconstruction or next life.

This effort connects both our city/community/county greenhouse gas mitigation goals and our climate resilience/adaptation goals. Presently we are grappling with how best to both reduce our contribution to climate change and increase our preparedness to changes that are here and projected.

In May 2020, Climate Smart Missoula, the City and County completed the Climate Ready Missoula plan, which identifies the greatest risks that climate change poses to Missoula County and the strategies to address those risks. When it comes to the built environment, we are facing hotter, smokier summers in addition to an aging housing and commercial building stock, and increasingly unaffordable housing prices. Low-income households disproportionately bear this burden; they are more likely to inhabit older, leakier residences, and spend a higher percentage of their income on energy.

Buildings(s) for the Future is intentionally working to marry affordable housing, low-carbon building, and community climate resiliency efforts to ensure that “green building” is not just a priority but has tools and momentum.

The National League of Cities Leadership in Community Resilience provided grant funding and technical guidance and the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) provided additional research and technical support. The effort is also strongly advised by a Missoula-based Task Force that includes:

- Caroline Lauer and Amy Cilimburg, Climate Smart Missoula
- Katie Deuel and Leigh Ratterman, Home ReSource
- Chase Jones, City of Missoula
- Diana Maneta, Missoula County
- Sarah Ayers and Luke Jackson, Loci Architecture + Design
- Shane Morrissey, MMW Architects
- Paul Herendeen, Clearwater Credit Union
- Rob Lindner, Central Street Ventures
- Damian Mast, HONE Architects & Builders
- Skander Spies, McKinstry

In January of 2021, Climate Smart Missoula hosted a virtual 2.5-hour summit to discuss decarbonizing Missoula’s buildings and inspire next steps for action. The virtual summit was informed by technical assistance from ACEEE on local green building policies and programs. This

report includes an overview of the summit and technical support, as well as suggested key next steps for Missoula to pursue in 2021 and beyond.

## **ACEEE Technical Assistance**

Through our participation in the 2020 National League of Cities' Leadership in Community Resilience cohort, we were able to receive free technical assistance from ACEEE. Their final technical assistance memo is attached as Appendix C (their Appendices are our Appendix D); in summary the memo provided information on strategies the City of Missoula and Missoula County could consider to decarbonize buildings, as well as provided methodology for evaluating strategies based on cost, staff capacity, and potential energy savings.

## **Overview of January 2021 Summit**

In April of 2020, Climate Smart Missoula, together with the City of Missoula, Missoula County, Home Resource, and partners planned to bring together community stakeholders for a green building summit called "Building(s) for the Future." The event was postponed due to COVID-19, and, eventually, we decided to shift to an early 2021 virtual convening.

The summit was designed to build on Missoula's recent progress on climate mitigation and adaptation (100% Clean Electricity Resolution, Climate Ready Missoula plan, Zero by Fifty plan, etc.), acknowledging that buildings are a part of each of these efforts and are becoming increasingly important as pressures mount for development to keep pace with community growth.

Nearly 200 Missoulians were invited, including architects, engineers, builders, contractors, real estate agents, appraisers, developers (for and non-profit), local government elected officials and staff, and University of Montana staff. Our extensive research together with ACEEE findings provided the foundation for a robust summit conversation. 135 people attended the summit which included first, a panel of national experts and practitioners and second, a discussion-based breakout group session.

**The Panel** shared innovative approaches to reducing building emissions and embodied carbon while also considering issues of equity and economics. It included:

- Leah Bamberger, the Director of Sustainability for the City of Providence, RI, spoke to Providence's Climate Justice Plan and the process behind developing it.
- Stefen Samarripas, Local Policy Manager for ACEEE, provided a national context to our discussions by detailing local building policy trends across the country.
- Luke Hollenkamp, the Sustainability Program Coordinator for the City of Minneapolis, MN, dove into the details of Minneapolis' disclosure policies.
- Douglas Gilliland, the President of Taurus of Texas Holdings detailed a net zero ready development in Austin, "Whisper Valley," and their geothermal heating and cooling grid.

- Michael Maines, a residential builder/designer, provided an overview of what it means to build a “Pretty Good House” (build above code to improve energy and sustainability measures and until it stops making financial sense).

Recordings of the presentations and the slides can be found here: [missoulaclimate.org/buildings](https://missoulaclimate.org/buildings).

**The Breakout Session** was designed to incorporate the panel presentations, assess what we know, and gather ideas and input from attendees to identify (and build momentum for) new policies and programs that will reduce carbon emissions from our building stock and built environment. Breakout groups considered owner-occupied homes, rental housing, large buildings, new developments and subdivisions, innovative approaches, developer incentives and deconstruction. Groups discussed the challenges inherent to decarbonizing buildings in Missoula, evaluated foundational strategies from the pre-reading “Background Briefs” and offered ideas for how these tools could be developed. The conversation then turned to evaluating the pros and cons of the primary strategies. Finally, each group discussed the timing and phasing of strategies.

**The Background Briefs** were key to the discussions; they detailed the aforementioned strategies Missoula could best pursue. Strategies were categorized as “foundational” or “primary.” Foundational strategies applied to all breakout groups and were included in every brief; they are strategies that make the primary strategies more effective or feasible. Primary strategies differed amongst the breakout groups and were customized to the topic at hand. The “Deconstruction/Next Life” group took a slightly different approach; they do not have a background brief, and will summarize the findings and next steps in a forthcoming report.

**Table 1** details the foundational and primary strategies, as well as what background briefs they appeared in. All the original background briefs are included in Appendix B.

Table 1. Foundational and Primary Strategies

KEY						
Type of Tool			Building Stage			
						
Incentive-Based	Regulatory	Education	Blueprint	Construction	Operation	Next Life (Deconstruction, Rehab)

Tool Name	Implementation Lever	Could advance objectives of...	Legality	Cost	Momentum	Selected Precedents
<b>Density Bonus</b>	Chapter 20 Ammended (Zoning)	   				Arlington, VA
 Qualifying projects can have more units than allowed in zoning. The increase in allowable units increases potential income for the developer, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>Reduced Parking Requirements</b>	Chapter 20 Ammended (Zoning)	   				Flagstaff, AZ, Denver, CO, State of California
 Qualifying projects can provide fewer parking spaces than allowed in zoning. The decrease in required parking reduces development costs, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>Relaxed Height Restrictions</b>	Chapter 20 Ammended (Zoning)	   				Arlington, VA
 Qualifying projects can build higher than allowed in zoning. The increase in height increases potential income for the developer, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>Reduced Impact Fees</b>	Municipal Code Section 15	   				Bernalilo County, NM
 Qualifying projects can pay reduced impact fee. The decrease in impact fees reduces development costs, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>Property Tax Abatement</b>	New local government program	   				Cincinnati, OH
 Qualifying projects pay a reduced property tax for a set number of years. The decrease in property taxes reduces development costs, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>TIF Funding Available</b>	State legislation passed	   				Chicago, IL
 Qualifying projects receive TIF funding. The increase in available financing reduces debt servicing costs, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>Reduced Permit Fee</b>	Fee Schedules Adjusted	   				San Diego, CA
 Qualifying projects pay reduced permit fee. The decrease in permitting fees reduces development costs, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>Expedited Permit Process</b>	Development Services Staff Expanded	   				San Diego, CA
 Qualifying projects go through an expedited and streamlined permitting process, reducing uncertainty and waiting time. This decreases debt servicing costs, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.						
<b>Local Carbon Offset Fund</b>	Public Private Partnership	   				Ithaca, NY, Sitka, AK, Juneau, AK, Seattle, WA
 Developing a local carbon offset fund can expand new financing sources and supplement existing residential retrofit programs. The public would be able to offset their own carbon footprints and accelerate low carbon building.						

KEY						
Type of Tool			Building Stage			
Incentive-Based	Regulatory	Education	Blueprint	Construction	Operation	Next Life (Deconstruction, Rehab)

Tool Name	Implementation Lever	Could advance objectives of...	Legality	Cost	Momentum	Selected Precedents
<b>Low Interest Rate Loans</b>	Financing Institutions					Missoula, MT
<i>Qualifying projects can access reduced interest rates on loan products. The lower debt servicing costs can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail. Clearwater Credit Union currently has a program.</i>						
<b>Bundled Loan Packages</b>	Financing Institutions					Connecticut Green Bank
<i>Qualifying projects can access bundled financial products. This decreases debt servicing costs, which can offset (and surpass) the higher costs that building beyond code may entail.</i>						
<b>Expansion of Design Excellence Overlay</b>	Chapter 20 Ammended (Zoning)					Pittsburgh, PA, Missoula, MT
<i>Amend current design excellence overlay to more holistically include the principles of low carbon building design. The current overlay encourages certain materials to be used over others, but this could be expanded.</i>						
<b>Disclosure Ordinance</b>	Local ordinance					Seattle, WA, Fort Collins, CO, and Philadelphia, PA (just a few)
<i>Require projects to disclose their materials, embodied energy, energy use, and deconstruction plans via an online data portal. This accelerates market pressure for higher performance, as well as collects data to inform better decisions.</i>						
<b>Electrification Ordinance</b>	Local ordinance					Berkeley, CA and San Jose, CA
<i>No new projects are permitted to install natural gas hook-ups. This could be specified to a certain subset of buildings that are a certain size.</i>						
<b>Home Energy Label Ordinance</b>	Local ordinance					Minneapolis, MN
<i>All home sales and rental leases must disclose the unit's energy report card at time of sale or lease.</i>						
<b>Green or White Roof Ordinance</b>	Local ordinance					Denver, CO
<i>A green or white roof ordinance would require certain new construction projects to include a green or white roof for a portion or all of their roof to decrease cooling load during the summer.</i>						
<b>PACE Enabling Legislation</b>	State legislation passed					In 37 states including Nevada, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico
<i>Property Assessed Clean Energy Programs, or PACE, allows a property owner to finance the up-front cost of energy or other eligible improvements on a property and then pay back the costs over time. It is attached to the property rather than the individual. First, Montana must pass PACE enabling legislation, which would allow counties to implement it. Northern Plains Resource Council is currently leading efforts to pass such legislation.</i>						

KEY						
Type of Tool			Building Stage			
Incentive-Based	Regulatory	Education	Blueprint	Construction	Operation	Next Life (Deconstruction, Rehab)

Tool Name	Implementation Lever	Could advance objectives of...	Legality	Cost	Momentum	Selected Precedents
<b>Stretch Code Enabling Legislation</b>	State legislation passed					Vermont, Massachusetts
	<i>Stretch code enabling legislation would allow municipalities to vote to adopt the Stretch Code (higher energy standards) in lieu of the base building energy code.</i>					
<b>Promotion of Flagship Projects</b>	Public private partnership					Sarasota, FL
	<i>Develop a recognition program for flagship projects, such as a story map, recognition placards, or a building tour (online or in person). The marketing campaign can serve multiple purposes, including community education, virtue signaling that this is a priority for Missoula, and recognition of project partners.</i>					
<b>One-Stop Shop</b>	Public private partnership					Energy Trust of Oregon and Energy Works of Fort Collins, CO
	<i>The 1-stop shop approach makes energy efficiency more accessible for a larger portion of the population (commercial and residential) by simplifying a complicated process. It requires a strong partnership with the local utility.</i>					
<b>Voluntary Disclosure Map</b>	Public private partnership					Seattle, WA, Fort Collins, CO, and Philadelphia, PA
	<i>A voluntary disclosure map creates market pressure for higher performance, as well as collects data to inform future decisions for building owners and operators, as well as policy makers. Climate Smart Missoula is currently developing this.</i>					
<b>Energy Savings Competition</b>	Public private partnership					Fargo, ND, Summit County, UT, Missoula, MT (previously)
	<i>An energy savings competition encourages owners and renters to reduce their energy consumption, all while building momentum and awareness at the ground level for greater energy awareness.</i>					
<b>On-bill financing</b>	Public private partnership					North and South Carolina, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Kansas
	<i>Property owners can access the capital needed to finance energy efficiency or renewable energy and repay the loan via monthly payments that are added to the utility bill. The energy savings are automatically factored in to the repayment.</i>					

## Findings and Next Steps

Four primary themes emerged from our original background research, breakout group discussions, and subsequent conversations with key leaders and our Task Force. Here we provide a brief description of each foundational strategy followed by a table which includes a suggested timeline for implementation. In the months and years to come, we know we need to move each of these themes forward.

### **Generate excitement and enthusiasm for a culture of low-carbon building, via ACEEE scorecard or other tools**

Decarbonizing Missoula's buildings from design to deconstruction will require buy-in, commitment, and excitement from a diverse group of stakeholders, including professionals in the building industry, local government staff and elected officials, property owners, and community members. Coalescing support behind a community goal or campaign has been a successful model in other communities, and summit participants identified this as an important step to take in the next year. One possible goal for the community to pursue is recognition as a top-10 ACEEE Scorecard city, a nationally known evaluation system that is free to participate in. The ACEEE Scorecard may be an appropriate metric for the next year, and there may be additional community campaign opportunities in the future, such as Living Futures' Community Challenge or Architecture 2030. In addition to pursuing a community-wide campaign, there is also a need for increased educational opportunities that build off of the virtual summit, including in-depth presentations for professionals and shorter, more accessible opportunities for those with a germinating interest. Along with this is a need to set any goals within the larger context of who Missoula is today and who we envision we'll be in a decade (a forward thinking, sustainable, equitable community who seeks and embraces new opportunities and paths).

### **Adopt local policy within the next year and create a phased policy approach extending to 2030.**

Summit participants were very supportive of new standards that would reduce building energy consumption and could be phased in over time. There is a desire for near-term adoption of new policy and for the development of a multi-year policy strategy, touching upon building design, operation, and deconstruction and extending from the present to 2030. The work plan chart (page 13) and Appendix A further inform this 10-year strategy. Two complementary options are of strong interest to initiate in the next year:

#### **1. Stretch Energy Code**

As an immediate next step, summit participants were enthusiastic about adopting a "stretch energy code," which is an incentive-based voluntary standard to reduce building energy consumption. Voluntary stretch codes are authorized by Montana state law,<sup>1</sup> and Missoula City

---

<sup>1</sup> Montana Code Annotated 50-6-102: "A county, city, or town with a building code enforcement program may, as part of its building code or by town ordinance or resolution, adopt voluntary energy conservation standards for new construction for the purpose of providing incentives to encourage voluntary energy conservation. The

Council Resolution 8250, adopted in 2018, directed City staff to determine the feasibility of a stretch energy code, and to develop one if feasible. A stretch code may be prescriptive or performance-based, and further discussions will be needed to determine its specific structure. The Energy Use Intensity standard (EUI) that is part of Missoula County's recently adopted green building policy for county-owned buildings is a possibility, as is LEED and other certifications. In addition, to be effective a stretch code will require meaningful incentives.

The "Developer Incentives" breakout group specifically dove into this; while there was not consensus on a particular incentive to offer, there was agreement that incentives must be balanced with existing incentives for affordable housing and historic preservation. More conversation and stakeholder engagement are needed between local government staff and developers to determine the board outlines and specifics of these incentives.

## **2. Energy Disclosure**

In addition to the adoption of a voluntary energy efficiency standard, a large building energy use disclosure ordinance was discussed across the breakout groups as an important strategy to pursue within the next year. Disclosure policies require building owners to disclose their building's energy consumption to either prospective buyers, lessees, or lenders or to governing bodies. The details of a disclosure ordinance, including the size and type of buildings that would be required to report, still need to be determined through further conversation. Disclosure ordinances have shown to spark significant energy reductions and can influence the building's economic value.

### **Expand existing resources and capacity.**

One of the foundational tools identified in the background briefs was the creation of a one-stop shop that would centralize resources for property owners, tenants, builders, contractors, developers, etc. The success of any policy or program will likely depend on the ability to access technical support, and one-stop shops have been a key component of other communities' successes. Missoula should pursue funding to create a staffed one-stop shop, and further discussion is needed to determine a vision of how this can grow to meet community needs and where this is housed.

### **Foster connections and pursue collaborative opportunities.**

The Building(s) for the Future effort is inherently collaborative and relates to and intertwines with many existing efforts and entities in the Missoula community, such as the Sxwtpquen Master Plan, Missoula County Zoning Update, the forthcoming Our Missoula growth policy update, Climate Ready Missoula, Home ReSource, Missoula Architects and Designers discussion group, Missoula Economic Partnership, Missoula Organization of Realtors, Invest Health, Missoula Housing Coalition, Missoula College, and others. Although not all these entities/efforts are primarily

---

incentive-based standards adopted may exceed any applicable energy conservation standards contained in the state building code."

focused on low-carbon building and sustainability, intentional and consistent connections can help integrate these priorities. Given our overarching community goals, together with increasing interest and funding at the federal level to address climate resiliency and reduce carbon pollution, we recommend structured conversations with key community leaders to determine the best approach to create a committed team able to capitalize on new collaborative opportunities.



**Building(s) for the Future DRAFT Workplan  
Spring 2021 - Spring 2022**

**2021**

**2022**

**Q2**

**Q3**

**Q4**

**Q1**

**Key Stakeholders (AT = Cross Sector  
Advisory Team, ++ = Community  
Partners TBD)**

**GENERATE EXCITEMENT AND ENTHUSIASM FOR A CULTURE OF LOW-CARBON BUILDING ("MOVEMENT BUILDING").**

**Outcome 1a: Pursue top-10 ranking in ACEEE's "Community Energy Challenge" scorecard. (Small city complement to national scorecard analysis.)**

Contact Stefen Samarripas about participation in "Community Energy Challenge."					CSM
Review baseline scorecard score with Self-Scoring tool.					CSM, CNTY, CITY
Identify areas for improvement.					CSM, CNTY, CITY, AT
Create 1-year plan for improving scorecard results, including publicity and engagement.					CSM, CNTY, CITY, AT
Final scoring by ACEEE.					

**Outcome 1b: Expand variety of educational opportunities for homeowners, landlords, tenants, real estate agents, developers, and building professionals.**

Following Building(s) for the Future Virtual Summit, generate and circulate findings report.					CSM, CNTY, CITY, AT
Identify topics for in-depth, follow-up conversations and short, audio or written segments that build on Summit.					CSM
Create "Developer's Guide to Sustainability Incentives" for Sxwptqyen Form Based Code.					
Develop resources on air source heat pumps and induction stoves to be distributed via Development Services.					
Host educational series with 1 event per quarter and 1 audio segment per month.					CSM++

**Outcome 1c: Increase consumer awareness of and demand for low carbon building.**

Work with local developers and builders to create a "sustainability add-on" for subdivision homes.					
Contact local real estate magazines, such as Homes and Land of Big Sky Country, for feature pieces on green building.					CSM
Identify trial cohort of 5 flagship projects to promote and initiate outreach.					CSM, AT, ++
Coordinate with Missoula City-County Health Department on anti-gas stove campaign.					
Coordinate with Missoula Current and "What's That Missoula?" segment to feature flagship projects.					CSM
Develop green building tour or physical placards to promote flagship projects.					CSM, AT
Enhance online Story Map and case studies to tell stories of flagship projects.					CSM

**ADOPT LOCAL POLICIES WITHIN THE NEXT YEAR AND CREATE A PHASED POLICY APPROACH EXTENDING TO 2030.**

**Outcome 2a: Adopt an incentive based voluntary standard to reduce building energy consumption.**

Consult with local government staff to evaluate the pros and cons between a stretch energy code and EUI standard.					CSM, CNTY, CITY
Gather stakeholders to evaluate potential developer incentives to accompany voluntary standard, balancing concerns for affordable housing and historic preservation.					CSM, CNTY, CITY, AT, HOMEWORD, PRIVATE DEV.
Drafting of policy and adoption.					CITY, CNTY

**Outcome 2b: Adopt a disclosure ordinance for large buildings.**

Catalogue existing building stock (square footage, commercial or residential use) to evaluate which size buildings would be included in disclosure ordinance.					CITY, CNTY
Develop policy provisions for affordable housing projects.					CITY, CNTY, ++
Research possible online portals for reporting.					CITY, CNTY
Drafting of policy and adoption.					CITY, CNTY

**Outcome 2c: Initiate a planning group to develop a phased policy approach from 2022 - 2030.**

Identify and recruit key stakeholders.					CITY, CNTY, CSM, AT
Begin meeting as a group.					CITY, CNTY, CSM, TBD

**EXPAND EXISTING RESOURCES AND CAPACITY**

**Outcome 3a: Create a 1-stop shop with centralized resources and staff capacity.**

Identify funding source to staff 1-stop shop.					CSM
Centralize existing resources in accessible, online presence.					CSM
Research possible bulk-buy strategies and funding sources.					CSM, CITY, CNTY



**Building(s) for the Future DRAFT Workplan  
Spring 2021 - Spring 2022**

**2021**

**2022**

**Q2**

**Q3**

**Q4**

**Q1**

**Key Stakeholders (AT = Cross Sector  
Advisory Team, ++ = Community  
Partners TBD)**

**CONNECTIONS + COLLABORATION**

**Outcome 4a: Support coordination of/among existing efforts.**

Facilitate conversation between Whisper Valley and Sxwtpqven Plan.					CSM
Further engagement of realty community via special presentation at INK.					CSM
Provide additional research support, as well as publicly support and advocate for, green building zoning requirements in Missoula County Zoning Update.					CSM, CNTY
Continuous engagement of and partnership with housing coalition and Invest Health group.					CSM, INVEST HEALTH, HOUSING, AT
Cross promote and partner with Missoula Architects and Designers for events.					CSM, MAD
Develop educational resources for developers who wish to take advantage of green building incentives in Sxwtpqven Master Plan.					CSM
Advance strategies 21 and 22 in Climate Ready Missoula (21: Develop programs to implement and incentivize more energy efficient building practices (new and retrofits) that are accessible to all socio-economic groups, including weatherization and cool roofs. 22: Develop an educational campaign to increase consumers' energy efficiency, with a focus on cooling.), as well as incorporate clean indoor air strategies.					CRM
Develop workforce development goals with Missoula Economic Partnership, Missoula College or others.					CSM, AT, MEP