

BEPS Task Force Meeting Notes – August 4, 2020

Task Force Member Attendees: Katie Bergfeld, Patti Boyd, Jen Croft, Marshall Duer-Balkind, Asa Foss, Dave Good, Max Greninger, Adrian Gross, Jessica Jones, Anica Landreneau, Cliff Majersik, Todd Nedwick

Public Attendees: Andrew Held, Sharon Jaye, Adefunke Sonaike, Kristian Hoffland, Dave Epley, Michael Feldman-Wiencek, Julia Field, Kevin Carey, Adam Szlachetka, Andrea Foss, Sean Fish, Emily Low, Cet Caldwell, Jochen Schaefer, Nathan Jeffay, Abby Mrvos, Taresa Lawrence, Michael Brown, Scott Emery, Frank LeBlanc, Wes Huffman

Agenda:

1. Administrative
 - a. Opened Meeting at 2:32pm
 - b. Attendance taken by roll call (see above) and quorum acknowledged
 - c. Role of Task Force, overall schedule, and current agenda reviewed
2. Higher Education/Hospital Sub-committee update
 - a. Discussed standard proposals and benchmarking changes at last meeting. Institutions are reviewing square footage of high intensity spaces at their campus and reporting back.
 - b. Next meeting August 12 is about compliance paths
3. Cost/Benefit Study Discussion (this section led by Steven Winter Associates)
 - a. Market Segmentation Analysis
 - i. What's done so far
 1. Market segmentation analysis to review, clean, and organize 2019 benchmarking data
 2. Data cleaning excluded properties with "bad" data including discrepancies year over year and between records
 3. >80% of properties represented by 4 main groups: Office, Multifamily, K-12 schools, and lodging (hotels)
 4. Construction years broke into 4 timeframes: pre-1940, 1940-70, 1970-2000, 2000-present
 5. Size of building proved significant below or above 100,000 square feet
 - ii. Determined 12 specific building typologies for deep dives - see slides 12-21 for information on specific types.
 - iii. How will cost data be determined?
 1. SWA hopes to work directly with the 12 specific buildings to determine actual cost data.
 2. SWA also encourages feedback from Task Force on how to best price measures.
 - b. General equity pillar **suggestions** for weighting Energy Efficiency Measures
 - i. Affordability
 1. Weight prescriptive measures that can be easily financed
 2. Weight prescriptive measures where benefits accrue to residents

3. Allow affordable housing to get partial credit for compliance by having a deeper energy master plan in place if aligned with some refi/capital cycle in the midterm.
 4. Pairing EE with housing policy and tenant protections
 5. Has the TOPA office been involved in any discussions? What implications could there be particularly with unregulated affordable housing where owners might fall back on BEPS as an excuse to raise rents
- ii. Workforce Development
1. Extra credit for work done by DC based or M/WBE firms
 2. Identify decent / high road jobs with relatively low barriers of entry – DC has done that in the past with stormwater work (green storm water management is landscaping as opposed to major pipes underground which require more specialized trades). Lean into upgrades that can be done with less skilled labor and then do some match making.
 3. Cool roofs: https://coolroofs.org/documents/NYC_CoolRoofs_6-14-17_Presentation.pdf
- iii. Health
1. Ventilation system upgrades?
 2. Compartmentalization between units
 3. Do some measures that deliver more health benefits than others and how to incentivize?
 4. Electrification to reduce fossil fuel use – especially fossil fuel use in apartments
 5. There are a lot of resources to deal with lead / mold / healthy homes – can those be leveraged?
 6. Big emphasis of schools and indoor air quality through LEED
- iv. Climate resiliency
1. Enhance cooling for buildings that do not have permanent comfort cooling – primarily pre 1940 – potentially a link to heat pumps
 2. Cool roofs
- c. Non-energy prescriptive items
- i. Benefits of electrification (fair way to handle that?)
 1. eliminating combustion equipment also improves IAQ; eliminating combustion-based equipment may also reduce risks from gas leaks or other hazards; public health (societal) costs should be included or evaluated
 2. Gas- saving updates/improvements with use of same equipment make sense, replacement of equipment with new equipment, don't think we should mandate gas on the Prescriptive list
 - a. Several members think that eliminating gas-improvement items on the prescriptive path would be a concern for operational cost

perspective and for properties that aren't doing significant upgrade.

- b. Several members don't think gas should be included because of IAQ/health risks, future cost burden, GHG impact will be static vs. electric should go to zero, and equipment replacement will generally happen once between now and 2050 so it's critical to replace when given the opportunity.
- c. Several members think there should be credit available for incremental improvement via gas equipment upgrades. Don't think incentives for owners should be limited (e.g. if a building has a boiler and the owner has decided it makes most business sense to replace it, should we not push them towards the more efficient models?)

ii. Weighting Considerations of non-energy benefits? Should each EEM be scored against non-energy benefit criteria?

- 1. General consensus that EEMs should be evaluated against additional criteria; two big categories discussed were societal benefits and DC's long-term climate goals.
- 2. Suggestion to look at valuation of other green programs? Green and Healthy Homes in Baltimore may have info. Some national labs have affordable housing studies.
- 3. For workforce development, you could discount the costs of measures that are the most labor-intensive, at least for weighting purposes, in order to incentivize it.
- 4. A pre-requisite for retro-commissioning (similar to Seattle's tune-ups) on the prescriptive path should be something that we want all properties to do
- 5. Suggestion to weight benefits toward time-of-use. E.g. a kWh saved on heating is worth more than a kWh saved on dishwashing

iii. What is right weighting scale?

- 1. Kristian's point about making a building's GHG profile WORSE is important and so I would encourage SWA to include the GHG impacts of various EEMs, evaluated using both today's electricity GHGI and future GHGIs with the increases in the RPS
- 2. Is there a way to pair non-energy benefits to energy items on the prescriptive path? Like if you choose to retro-commission and received 3 points, you could add another 1-2 points if you develop staff training plan and execute it. Maybe the non-energy benefits don't have value unless it's paired with EEM?

d. Education strategy overview (see slides 24-29)

i. Structure, Task and purpose

1. Looking at 3 primary time segments: immediate (2020 pre-launch), year one (2021), and compliance (2022-2026)
 - ii. Target Audiences - Task Force did not raise concerns of any omitted audience segments
 - iii. Connecting to the **why, what, when, and how**
 - iv. Possible Outputs (channels for distribution)
 - v. Discussion: Any gaps?
 1. There seems to be overlap with Hub outreach, is coordination happening? SWA: yes, coordinating directly with Lindsey Falasca to ensure no duplication of efforts
 - e. CBA asks from TF
 - i. Need help on gathering cost data on buildings that fit the building typologies identified. If you'd like to help SWA directly, email Sharon or Andrew @ DOEE.
4. Alternative Compliance Path Discussion – below reflects discussion only – see slides 30-36 for content
- a. RFI Process
 - i. Does DOEE have the capacity to review all the RFIs? DOEE – that's part of the question. The RFI needs to be significantly different from the existing paths to be able to be approved. Suggestion to build out more prescriptive guides upfront such as deep energy retrofits, affordable housing re-financing cycles, multiple buildings, multiple cycle compliance, etc. to try to minimize staffing time on the most common requests.
 - ii. Concern about how long is the RFI open, because some project teams may not realize they need an ACP until they get into the project, so it may be into the cycle
 - iii. An RFI is good with two caveats: only one response required for a single ACP proposal that applies to multiple buildings, and also that it must be linked to specific building(s) (no general concepts from people who want their interest represented)
 - b. Intent
 - i. Intent of ACPs is for properties to be able to comply in ways other than the 3 base pathways, adjust base pathways due to special circumstances, or meet legal requirements of BEPS
 - ii. Project-specific ACPs that work well could be generalized and become pre-approved ACPs in future cycles though
 - iii. Sub-buildings--you could have a use case where a complex commercial condo structure wants to do separate paths for different condo sections
 - iv. Perhaps it allows for an owner to take more risk... and do something more innovative than they might do on the performance path.
 - c. Pre-Approved ACPs - Properties won't have to submit a request to use these: Deep Energy Retrofit, Single owner portfolio, Higher Education/Hospital, Affordable Housing
 - d. Core Criteria

- i. Applicant for ACP needs to demonstrate how their unique situation can't be accommodated by the existing compliance paths. If an owner wants to choose the ACP path, it should be on that owner to demonstrate the value of taking that path.
 - ii. DOEE should provide examples of what that sort of justification looks like (for example, applies to many buildings, applies to more cycles, etc). Maybe DOEE could provide a decision tree to provide educational component to help properties understand what pathways/options are available to them.
 - iii. Discussion about what "measurable and verifiable" means: these means would have to be similar to measuring the performance of the performance path or verifiable similar to the prescriptive path. The submitter could use examples of the measures or verifications used on the regular paths.
 - e. Optional Criteria
 - i. Non-energy items - DCSEU is able to claim savings for participants that complete Building Operator Certification (BOC) training that manage a certain ft2 of building.
- 5. Monthly webinar update
 - a. DOEE's first monthly update webinar went very well. Turned into a great [video](#) for the basic understanding of BEPS.
 - b. Would love the Task Force's help on promoting future sessions. Send people to the [Eventbrite](#) link.
- 6. Award announcement – Congratulations to all the Task Force members on the USGBC NCR leadership award. If you haven't received your certificate, please email Sharon.
- 7. Next Meeting – August 18 (still working on agenda – will email it out when ready)
 - a. Sub-committee update
 - b. Possible follow-up from cost/benefit study?
 - c. Other guidance document topics?
- 8. Announcements
 - a. IMT is hiring: Director, [Private Sector Engagement](#)
 - b. DOEE is hiring an Equity and Engagement Program Analyst in the Urban Sustainability Administration. The position is listed as "Open to the Public" and has a closing date of September 2, 2020. For more detailed information regarding this opportunity, please visit the District's career website at <https://careers.dc.gov> and search for #11019.
- 9. Closed meeting at 4:31pm