

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Department of Energy and Environment



BEPS Task Force Meeting Notes

February 18, 2020, 2:30-4:30 PM

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

TF Attendees: Matt Praske, Jen Croft, Asa Foss, Marshall Duer-Balkind, Dave Good, Joe Reilly, Adrian Gross, Patti Boyd, Reshma Holla, Jessica Jones, Katie Bergfeld, Todd Nedwick, Wendell Felder, Maxwell Greninger, Cliff Majersik (phone)

1. Administrative Items

- a. Swearing in of Task Force Members that were not sworn in at November ceremony.
- b. Review decision points from last week
 - i. Fines should be based on percentage of achievement towards goal

Task Force Decision: All present voted in favor of this.

- ii. Fines should be based on building size – changed wording from “square feet” to “building size” so that building size can be defined later based on property type if needed.
 1. Scale by btu away from goal?
 2. Scale by assessed value?
 - a. Would help avoid sticker shock fines
 - b. This could be part of extensions, not fines

Task Force Decision: All present voted in favor of this, but requested more research on the best definition of building size.

2. Performance Pathways

- a. Revisited previous topic of performance pathway options
 - i. Gap reduction and base performance pathways net larger savings in the early years
 - ii. Both options of Gap reduction are really hard to explain to building owners. Might create confusion in marketplace.
 - iii. Need to outline functionally on how compliance with performance pathway

Task Force Discussion: Removed “gap reduction” options from further discussion. Asked for more modelling on median target scenario for long term impact

3. Alternative Certifications

- a. Agreement that these are not necessarily alternative compliance pathways but could be used as documentation for compliance. Will revisit the topic at a later time when compliance process is discussed.
- b. Enterprise Green Communities may still be looked at in depth as an alternative compliance path for affordable housing property type.

Task Force Decision: Move to Bike Rack until we discuss documentation

4. Setting Standard above the local median for groups below the national median - Region Comparison analysis

Task Force Decision: Move to Bike Rack until Anica is back

5. Prescriptive Path

- a. Discussion on the benefits and goals of the prescriptive path:
 - i. Cost and compliance certainty
 - ii. Clarity
 - iii. Helps inexperienced building owners
 - iv. No energy modeling needed
 - v. Buying time for future performance improvements
 - vi. Lower risk
 - vii. Might be a better option depending on property type
 - viii. Lower soft costs
 - ix. Guidance can be provided by DOEE
- b. Presented possible structure of prescriptive path as presented to working groups with their feedback
 - i. Possible minimum requirements (audits, retro-commissioning, training)
 - ii. O&M strategies list and Project-based strategies list
 - iii. Feedback from working group - flexibility, certainty, coaches or online tools, alignment across agencies, audits and retro-commissioning as a minimum requirement (or to weight things differently as incentives)
- c. Discussion from Task Force and Public
 - i. Should there be minimum requirements?
 1. Concerns about spending money on audits when owners know what needs to be done.
 2. What would be the verification process? O&M is a big deal but how do you ensure the work is being done properly over time?

3. Could weight some measure more heavily to incentivize item instead of requiring it.

Task Force Discussion: Members split evenly on having minimum requirements. The members who favored no minimum requirements were more apt to like the idea of adding additional weight to items to provide incentive.

- ii. Should the pathway be a firm schedule or a menu of operations/maintenance and project-based strategies?

Task Force Discussion: Everyone present preferred the idea of a menu of strategies to choose from instead of a prescribed schedule (more flexibility for different property types). Two members preferred project-based strategies only. Remaining members liked the mix of O&M and Project-Based options.

- iii. Should the items have weighted values for each item based on energy savings potential?

Task Force Discussion: All present favored weighted values.

6. Next Task Force Meeting

- a. Continue Prescriptive Path discussion – compliance process
- b. Sub-committee report-out
- c. Review of Bike Rack for rule-affecting items
- d. Possible Higher education carve-out discussion

7. Announcements

- a. Vacancy sub-committee meeting Feb. 19
- b. Public sub-committee meeting Feb. 25
- c. Benchmarking webinar on automatic reporting – Feb. 24
- d. Benchmarking webinar on aggregating utility data – Feb. 25