

BEPS Task Force Meeting Notes
March 2, 2021

Task Force Member Attendees: Katie Bergfeld, Patti Boyd, Jen Croft, Marshall Duer-Balkind, Dave Good, Max Greninger, Adrian Gross, Reshma Holla, Jessica Jones, Anica Landreneau, Cliff Majersik, Todd Nedwick, Matt Praske, Joe Reilly, Jay Wilson

Public Attendees: Andrew Held, Sharon Jaye, Molly Hoffsommer, Michael Feldman-Wiencek, Cet Caldwell, Kevin Carey, Nathan Jeffay, Sean Fish, Joe Knackstedt, Tim Oberleiton, Roger Chang, Donald Walker, Bryan Snyder, Chris Pendley, Aykut Yilmaz, Melissa Burant, Paul Borissow, Michele Good, Coral Pais, Paul CEG Solutions, Jochen Shaefer, Taresa Lawrence, James Ball, Julian Belity, Scott Emery, Stephen Greg, Kehan Desousa,

The notes reflect the discussion only – please see the referenced slide for content presented.

Meeting Agenda:

1. Administrative (slides 1-5)
 - a. Opened meeting at 2:32pm
 - b. Attendance taken by roll call (see above); Quorum acknowledged
 - c. Reviewed role of TF and today's agenda
2. Prescriptive Pathway updated proposal
 - a. Timeline and Submissions (slide 6)
 - i. DOEE: tweaks to the process. Several items wrapped into energy audit process. 2-cycle plan moved to be part of design charette. At end of phase 2 – DOEE approves final EEMs, assigns point for enforcement, and building owner signs agreement.
 - b. Minimum % Savings requirement (slide 7-8)
 - i. Several concerns for hotels, K-12 schools, etc, virtually all properties in the prescriptive path will need to identify 40%--this rule is actually going to capture more buildings than the approach covered two weeks ago. If the concern is making sure that enough savings are identified to get to standard, in either one cycle or two, then ask the auditor to estimate the % savings needed to hit that target, and if that's greater than 20%, identify >30% savings.
 - ii. Some feel its an over-reach. Suggest making this a suggestion, not a requirement of the prescriptive pathway.
 - iii. Identifying additional savings is not a problem, but it also doesn't necessarily translate to actualized savings.
 - c. Targeted Savings % for Final EEM Package (slide 9)
 - d. Fossil Fuel Burning Equipment (slide 9)
 - i. Avoiding or eliminating NG may lead to a higher ES score in some cases. So, for future cycles, do owners who choose not to use NG to get some leeway on their Energy Star Score?
 - e. Design Charette Guide and Questions (slide 10-11)
 - i. TF suggests calling this something else (ex: integrated design workshop...)

- ii. EGC/DHCD may have good templates
 - f. Optimization of Final EEM Package (slide 12)
- 3. Retro-commissioning discussion (slide 13)
 - a. Creating fast-moving, minimum # of meetings, technical subcommittee to vet template
 - b. General TF agreement with creating sub-committee
- 4. Baseline Adjustments (slides 14-20)
 - a. Takeaways: Eligibility for historic buildings should be expanded to historic districts; many new considerations for indoor air quality due to COVID that TF supported having adjustments for – DOEE noted list of eligible circumstances is not exhaustive
 - b. Questions from TF & public about what technical evidence will need to be provided to determine the size of the baseline modification (DOEE will provide in the guidebook)
- 5. FC1148 Update (slide 22-23) – no discussion
- 6. 2023 Construction Code (slide 24)
- 7. Webinar update (slide 25)
- 8. BEPS rulemaking and timeline update (slide 26)
- 9. Overall Agenda review (slide 27)
- 10. Next Meeting – March 30 (slide 28)
- 11. Announcements (29) - none
- 12. Closed meeting at 4:25pm