**BEPS Task Force Meeting Notes**

January 7, 2020, 2:30-4:30pm

1200 First St NE, 5th Floor, Washington, DC 20002

**Administrative**

* Co-chairs of task force – Matt Praske, Marshall Duer-Balkind, Anica Landreneau
* Following up with MOTA on admin items in new year

**Role of Task Force**

* Advise DOEE on creation of an implementation plan for the Building Energy Performance Program; recommend amendments to proposed regulations issued by DOEE; and recommend complementary programs or policies.
* Suggestion: Cover individual topics in each meeting without necessarily coming to a recommendation on each item, then revisit all topics for final recommendation discussion later on (so many topics interweave, it’s difficult to make decisions early on.)

**Property Types**

* Reviewed working group scenarios and feedback from July 16 session
* Analysis based on all data available (90% compliance, not just the 80% accepted submission). Used 2018 benchmarking data with updated 2019 Energy Star modeling.
* Methodology for establishing type definition
  + Level 1 - Primary Property types
    - Question about energy star score and ability to get certified. Certification is due to EPAs confidence in underlying model. Correlation between buildings is not impacted, would not affect the usage of the score/metric for BEPS purposes.
  + Level 2 - Same ESPM Scoring model type
  + Level 3 - National median reference type
    - Possible final step in grouping types?
    - Possible to set a higher bar in DC if the group has to compare to national median (halfway between 50 and 75?)
  + Level 4 - Custom groupings (types under 10)
    - Statistically significant normal distribution for 4 final groupings
    - Possibly look at COSTAR data for further analysis
    - Not sure about Level 4 groupings of buildings and ability to enforce issues
    - This level represents the 5% outliers – we should tackle smaller building groups in a couple of months after other topics are discussed
  + Miscellaneous
    - We will be looking at smaller property type groups when <50K buildings come on line later on
    - Important to consider where threshold is set and the impact of it in each type
    - Multifamily – what about estimates (instead of actual usage) from central plant facilities (like campuses or district energy loops); concerned about over-simplified grouping and economies of scale for smaller properties; master metered versus individually metered;
    - Affordable housing – is future analysis available for registered vs. naturally occurring? (not at this time because no data set available with that identification)
    - Mixed Use properties concerned about being lumped into one category with other non-mixed-use
    - Thought about creating different sub-groups for compliance pathways, maybe not for creating the groups for the median/score

**Equivalent Metric**

* Reviewed working group scenarios and feedback from July 16 session
* Niche categories 5-10% need an equivalent metric. 90-95% qualify for an energy star score
* Methodology review – run by TAG previously
* Concern about confusing owners with source EUI for Standard versus Site EUI used in the performance pathway
* Source EUI is closest to energy star score;
* If we don’t use weather-normalized EUI, what to do about different systems in buildings and not normal weatherizing (example – all electric building during a polar vortex being penalized in EUI versus natural gas building). Weather normalized is usually only used for comparing multiple years. The BEPS will only consider one year of data when setting the standard.
* Propose using a metric that helps DC meet its carbon and electrification goals
* Did a vote to see where people landed in their preference for the equivalent metric; no clear winner and most abstain

**Bike Rack (for future discussion)**

* Concern for a property type group that has only one building owner represented (ex. DGS and public service spaces)
* Concern about age of building and groupings
* Equity and analysis based on unavailable data – other compliance paths? Exceptions?
* Look at metrics for compliance pathways; short term vs. long term goals
* Public building portfolio and issues;
* Ratcheting down in size will add more buildings to the list that will increase the number of building who have to use the equivalent metric
* In the 2nd cycle, do the smaller sq. ft. buildings get put into the same group as larger buildings?

**Next meeting – Performance and Other Compliance Pathways**

* Early compliance – deep retrofits in exchange for extended compliance?
* Possibility for tradable allowances? Within a portfolio or DC-wide? Maybe energy efficiency credits (like stormwater?)
* Long term versus short term – meeting district goals in compliance paths
* District energy systems?
* Affordable housing requirements – review existing reqts. and match with BEPS
* Look at other certification possibilities (like LEED or living building)

**Announcements**

* Job Opportunities:
  + IMT: [Director, High-Performance Building Hub](https://www.imt.org/about/jobs/#DirectorDCHighPerformanceHub) – closes soon!
  + DOEE: [Energy Program Analyst/Benchmarking](https://careers.dc.gov) - Job ID 9506 – closes Jan. 26, 2020
  + DC Green Bank: [Executive director](https://dcgreenbank.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/DCGB_CEO-Job-Description-1.pdf) – closes Jan. 10, 2020
  + DCSEU [Intern Postions](https://dcseu-veic.icims.com/jobs/search?ss=1&notFound=1&mobile=false&width=1140&height=500&bga=true&needsRedirect=false&jan1offset=-300&jun1offset=-240) – various closing dates; see website for more info
* [Net-Zero Energy Project Design Assistance grants](https://doee.dc.gov/node/1449581) – Jan. 27, 2020 deadline