

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Department of Energy and Environment



BEPS Task Force Meeting Notes

May 26, 2020, 2:30-4:30 PM

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

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

Public Attendees: Andrew Held, Sharon Jaye, Molly Hofsommer, Kate Johnson, Adefunke Sonaike, Dave Epley, Michael Feldman-Wiencek, Kristian Hoffland, Kevin Carey, Sean Fish, Meghan McAvoy, Julie Field, Emily Low, Kudret Utebay

Agenda:

1. Administrative Items
 - a. Opened Meeting at 2:30pm
 - b. Attendance taken by roll call (see above) and quorum acknowledged
 - c. Role of Task Force, Meeting Schedule, Agenda, (Sharon)
 - d. Overall Schedule
 - i. Shifting focus for a while now that the draft rules are off on their process.
 - ii. DOEE will be coming back to Task Force in the future to discuss and get feedback on the TF Report, Cost/Benefit Study and Prescriptive Path, Guidance Documents, and the Public Comment Review process.
2. Brainstorming (Sharon)
 - a. Top Concerns (organized into 3 top categories plus 1 “other”)
 - i. Need Technical Assistance
 1. Affordable Housing developers are going to be lost when they get notified they aren’t compliant. Need a website, POC, etc.
 2. More than tech assistance, need project management assistance
 3. BEPS rules and how to respond aren’t intuitive, need an advisor to help navigate nuances. Flashback to stormwater regs implementation
 4. Design teams will be focusing on establishing a site EUI target and wanting to know what they need to do to be “safe” from BEPS. How does design translate to performance of building? How will BEPS impact design-community’s work?
 - ii. Need Workforce Development
 1. Equitable and local distribution of workforce development focus, not tunnel vision on carbon/energy

- 2. Should be a job creation measure in addition to being a carbon/energy saving program
 - iii. Cost – Need Incentive/Financing
 - 1. Equity issues for low-resourced buildings
 - 2. Asked frequently about incentives/financing out of fear that costs will be high.
 - 3. Rent-control rents going up if owners use capital improvement petition to comply with BEPS
 - iv. Other Concerns
 - 1. BEPS may not be enough to get DC on track to 2032 GHG commitment. (DOEE doesn't think modeling agrees with this statement)
 - 2. Renewable industry concerned with relationship of solar to BEPS
- b. Complementary Programs or Policies - What support do we need to build out to support building owners? (notes reflect discussion - see slides for additional ideas)
 - i. Technical Assistance
 - 1. Anticipate people looking to SEU for support programs, SEU should provide audits or access to auditors
 - 2. NOAH often falls through the cracks, very important to pay specific attention...Re: audit: issue around audit quality, need vetted list of participating auditors
 - 3. Beyond benchmarking services are low cost, high value
 - ii. Workforce Development
 - iii. Incentives/Financing
 - 1. Re: rising rent – opportunity to subsidize efficiency upgrades for owners in exchange for keeping rents the same. Especially NOAH. Examples in the NHT report.
 - 2. Public ESCO discussion: potential program model for investors to pay for upgrades and receive energy savings payback so no capital upfront for owners. But would require handing over full management of building to investor.
 - iv. Other comments
 - 1. Wary of having too many new support programs that can't be followed or known
 - 2. How to address equity when setting up the programs?
- c. Key Partners (notes reflect discussion - see slides for additional ideas)
 - i. DOEE is already interacting/supporting DCSEU, DC Green Bank, High Performance Building Hub. Brainstorm other key partners.
 - ii. DC Green Bank will help with underwriting lending training
- d. Task Force Involvement
 - i. As a Task Force, how would you like to be involved in the development of the programs? What is your role?

1. Several members feel like Green Bank and Hub have been established to develop complementary BEPS programs and Task Force can support as needed.
 2. TF likes the idea of the partners coming to the TF soliciting feedback on particular ideas, things that the partners need the TF's opinion or feedback on.
 - e. Timing of meetings
 - i. Not much discussion on duration of meetings. Some discussed meeting fatigue due to the pandemic and teleworking. Will work on schedule before making final decision on timing of meetings.
3. Open Discussion
 - a. Do co-chairs have enough info to develop upcoming TF agendas?
 - i. Anica: yes, but can only do certain topics that are not dependent on information under development (such as cost-benefit study, prescriptive path, etc.)
 - ii. Marshall/Katie: Can probably identify and start work on those topics that are dependent on other items even if can't complete the work
 - b. Katie (DOEE): Update on DOEE budget hearing from May 21, Director Wells said that BEPS program is priority and foresees sufficient funding to move forward and fund the programs needed to support BEPS. Director Wells also testified that building industry reps are suggesting flexibility in compliance with BEPS due to public health crisis. DOEE is working on internally.
 - c. Anica: Potential legislation to expand and make flexible the Green Building Fund spending. Any anticipation that it will affect BEPS funding?
 - i. Kate J.: Funding is staying the same through FY21 per letter of intent signed at beginning of FY20.
 - ii. Anica: Legislation only affecting DCRA? And chance that GBF changes could affect BEPS funding beyond FY21?
 - iii. Kate J.: Yes, understanding is that DCRA will be affected as of now. GBF and BEPS funding beyond FY21 are not knowable at this time.
 - iv. Anica: Drafting letter to council to request GBF changes don't happen. Several other private industry TF members said they are interested in signing.
4. Announcements
 - a. No announcements