

BEPS Task Force Meeting Notes September 1, 2020

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

Public Attendees: Andrew Held, Sharon Jaye, Molly Hoffsommer, Kate Johnson, Adefunke Sonaike, Kristian Hoffland, Michael Feldman-Wiencek, Dave Epley, Adam Szlachetka, Cet Caldwell, Kevin Carey, Abby Mrvos, Sean Fish, Kehan Desousa, Emily Low, Michele Good, Sarah Kogel-Smucker, Heidi Tseu, Nathan Jeffay, Michael Brown, Renee McPhatter, Megan Chapple, Scott Emery, Janine Helwig, Andrea Foss, Jeff Mang, Jochen Schaefer,

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

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 review, and current agenda reviewed
2. Higher Education/Hospital Carve-out Recommendations
 - a. Campus Definition clarifications (slide 8)
 - i. No questions or discussion
 - b. Hospitals Standard (slide 9)
 - i. No questions or discussion
 - c. Higher Education Standard (slide 10)
 - i. Feedback to question: Where there is a small total quantity of a particular building type (e.g. libraries), and the scores are scattered locally, the National Median ENERGY STAR Score will be used for the high intensity adjustment.
 - d. Compliance Pathways (slide 11)
 - i. Deep Retrofit Pathway – is considered an ACP, but would be more of an extended compliance option for campuses as opposed to early compliance option for private buildings
 - ii. General TF feedback:
 1. Broad agreement that this is a sensible approach and result of discussions
 2. Would affordable housing campuses (e.g. Edgewood Gardens) be eligible to move through campus pathway as laid out here? There is consideration built-in to Portfolio Manager to account for different use types within a multifamily complex. If there are specific additional use types that would not be covered by this, multifamily would be able to apply for an ACP that is modeled after this approach. However, the campus carve-out is specifically to be used by universities and hospitals

per the BEPS legislation, so multifamily campuses couldn't directly use this pathway.

e. **Vote on Higher Education/Hospital Recommendations (slide 12): All TF members present unanimously voted to support these recommendations.**

f. Sub-committee staying open for now to discuss deep retrofit campus pathway in September. DOEE will reach out to Consortium and DCHA for individual focus groups and education separate from the sub-committee work.

3. Prescriptive Path - Part 1

a. DOEE presented overview of all slides (14-22), and then returned to each slide for feedback. Feedback below is through Phase 1 (slide 19). Will continue feedback at September 15 meeting.

b. Overview (slide 15)

c. Purposes (slide 16)

i. Framework

1. Comment: This is necessarily a highly-prescriptive path and if owners don't want to do these things, they don't need to do it. Great point to make that a value of this is to provide guardrails to help inexperienced owners navigate BEPS successfully.

ii. *Are we missing anything? Questions?*

1. Will there be a Standard Target Prescriptive Path option?

a. No, because each building using the standard target would have different goals. The prescriptive path is for buildings that need the full 20% reduction.

2. Note that pursuing the standard target pathway isn't always easier or the best option even if a property is eligible to do so given considerations for ES Score calculations.

d. Guiding Principles (slide 17)

i. Require robust M&V to ensure accountability and transparency

1. Need to define M&V and recognize it's not necessarily identical to or practical to match industry concept of M&V. DOEE responded that this items is more about the accountability for reporting the prescriptive measures but also the need for measuring the impact of individual measure to make sure the modeling for the prescriptive path is good (adjustments might need to be made for the 2nd cycle). Will work on appropriate M&V opportunities on the individual measures and adjust the wording of this guiding principle accordingly.

2. DOEE clarified that M&V is not for compliance purposes. Completing the steps of the prescriptive path is the measure for compliance, not reaching a 20% reduction. Not realizing a specific savings target while using the prescriptive path would preclude you from using the prescriptive path a 2nd cycle.

ii. Ensure the program aligns with District plans & initiatives

1. Would it be worth calling out the long-term climate goals in more detail?
 - iii. Address equity components across the BEPS program.
 1. How specifically is equity being addressed? DOEE gave several general examples but acknowledged that this needs to be spelled out more clearly about the prescriptive path in the guidance.
 - e. Timeline (slide 18)
 - i. Note that each phase is not necessarily equal to a year in length.
 - ii. DOEE building out a BEPS portal that will manage all documentation submittals
 - f. Phase 1 - Project Assessment and Preliminary Plan (slide 19)
 - i. Project Assessment
 1. The requirements listed here are essentially describing an ASHRAE Level 2 audit. Whatever is required here will create an industry/market for what type of report is needed. Concerns about workforce availability.
 2. How does the TF think quality of an audit could be checked? Risk is poor quality audits without minimum standards of audits. Anticipating a workforce capacity issue and having an “approved” list could create a bottleneck.
 3. Will the cost/benefit analysis take into consideration the costs associated with this process, e.g. compensating the project team, cost of the audit, etc.? Possibly, depends on what type of cost information the team is able to collect.
 4. What about audits that were done before Phase 1 (e.g. in 2019 or 2020 for BEPS 1)? DOEE: if they’re substantially similar to what is being requested, probably will accept. TF: audits and EEMs done in 2019 and 2020 should count. Any earlier and it should be showing up in the baseline performance. Depending on the results of early action, the owner might consider the performance path as a better alternative.
 - ii. Preliminary Plan
 1. Owner may be different in 3 cycles. Hard to plan for 3-cycle improvements if we don’t know where the standard will be in 3 cycles. Audit and 3-cycle plan should stay with the property if sold/transferred if possible.
 - g. Phase 2-Action Plan: Charrette, Action Plan, & Design (slide 20)
 - i. Feedback scheduled for Sept 15
 - h. Phase 3-Implementation, Testing & Training (slide 21)
 - i. Feedback scheduled for Sept 15
 - i. Phase 4-Evaluation, Monitoring, and Verification (slide 22)
 - i. Feedback scheduled for Sept 15
4. Next Meeting - September 15
 - a. Prescriptive Path – Part 2 – finish the feedback on the process (phase 2-3) and delve into EEM structure. Targeting Sept 29 meeting for individual EEM measures.

5. Monthly webinar update
 - a. August 27 webinar went well; did a deep dive on DCSEU in addition to the BEPS overview and updates – 110 signed up, 60 attended, 50% of registrations were new people; recording available on BEPS website
 - b. Next webinar will focus on Hub launch – September 24. Please share social media post.
 - c. October 29 will focus on Green Bank.
6. Task Force Report – asking for volunteers to help review/edit – please email Sharon if interested
7. Announcements
 - a. DCSEU data verification webinar on September 29 – sign up at <https://www.dcseu.com/about/events/verifying-energy-benchmarking-data-webinar>
8. Closed meeting at 4:30pm.