

CPAC Meeting

November 16, 2021

Present: Melissa Chan (chair), Steven Nutter (vice chair), Tom Chase (secretary), Keren Schlomy, David Rabkin, Keith Giamportone, Rosalie Anders, Peter Crawley, Jerrad Pierce, Lyn Huckabee, Paula Phipps, Ted Live; *staff*: Susanne Rasmussen, Seth Federspiel, John Bolduc, Nikhil Nadkarni

Guests: Councilor Quinton Zondervan; Alex Steinbergh, Ann Stewart, Sharon Devos

1. Approval of October Minutes

Minutes of the October 14, 2021 meeting were approved.

2. ETP Director's Report

No report to accommodate main agenda items.

3. Net-Zero Action Plan (NZAP) Letter (Peter)

a. Seth update of 50 Year update of NZAP: Task Force looking to further refine draft plan Meeting this week. See PowerPoint slides [insert Slide 6 on Action Map]

b. Peter: The Letter summarizes CPAC Subcommittee work, discussed last meeting. Important to get a letter out tomorrow because NZAP Task Force is meeting Thursday, possibly for the last time (as is Climate Crisis Working Group which has asked for CPAC's views), but it can be followed with an addendum letter.

Review of Draft Letter:

Context, sense of urgency, need for pace of reduction to accelerate. "To align with a 1.5 degree Science-based target by 2030, the Building Sector would need to reduce annual emissions by 51%," and BEUDO is a key component of that. But the sum of the actions in the Preliminary Final Draft NZAP does not get us to that level of reduction. We need to try our best and be very aggressive.

Custom Retrofit Program should either be made mandatory or more attractive. Transactions happen over a long period of time. We can't wait – need another mechanism to compel emissions reductions.

Steve N Noted that CPAC gave the Subcommittee a proxy vote – get it out as soon as possible.

Lynn – Is it worth putting here (rather than at the end) that City Manager should think about adopting PACE? Wherever we note a gap of funding can note that adopting PACE would allow people to pay for improvements. Peter noted that PACE was eliminated from the NZAP.

John – We scheduled a short time on the letter and most time on BEUDO. Suggest removing all BEUDO comments from the letter and issue a separate letter based on BEUDO amendments.

Jerrad – Agrees with removing BEUDO because it is new and does not reflect the latest amendments.

Make upgrades mandatory on a timeline rather than point of sale.

Jerad – Can't force people to install solar – big investment.

Keren – Asked for Objections -

Lauren - Objects to Length, Density, Tone of letter. Could be 3 pages. Tone turned her off.

David – Need to share the draft, even knowing things will change. Sharing well-informed ideas that need to be put into the discussion. The letter will be helpful to everyone.

Steven – Supports getting something out tomorrow by noon for value it can provide.

Peter: Motion to distribute letter tomorrow, strip out detailed BEUDO comments - Approved

Julie – call it an initial take given urgency and the need to act.

4. BEUDO Amendments (Seth)

Presentation by Seth of key slides (13-14) Performance Requirements; (15-16) Calculating GHG Emissions including predictive publishing emission factors; (17-28) Compliance Pathways including Renewable Energy, Alternative Compliance Payments, Early Baseline Option; Labs, Affordable Housing, Campus; (29) Exemptions; (30) Penalties; (31) Policy review at end of first year.

Tom shared comments by Subcommittee: Opposition to ACP (pay to pollute), concern about speed of ramping down (steeper reduction sooner needed), use social cost of GHG rather than abatement cost; Need to prioritize efficiency over other options; Expanding population of buildings covered wont have much benefit in emissions but it has social benefits; Labs should have a "use" definition not CFM (air); Creating an independent advisory board; Enforce immediately; Adopt a schedule to look at fossil fuel bans.

Jerrad – Should large medical facilities be in the Labs category (hospitals, medical facilities)? Keith agreed.

Why delay Labs compliance? Seth: New buildings not set yet, waiting for state. Existing labs – give more time for retrofits but still make up all required emissions. The whole building.

Why only 1 year review? Because it is an ordinance, not a plan like NZAP, but there can be review at subsequent times.

Seth shared Boston's plan, which takes effect in 2030 but covers smaller buildings (20,000sf commercial vs 25,000sf; 15 units residential versus 50 units). Has only a minimal impact on emissions reduced and would heavily impact City's staff time to enforce and buildings ability to meet.

Melissa asked when we have another opportunity to comment on BEUDO? John noted we don't need to wait a month, can take it up sooner as long as we schedule a meeting. Do we want a subcommittee? Peter asked if anyone wants to join NZAP subcommittee that makes sense rather than a new subcommittee.

David – could we use the Subcommittees comments in a "Please consider these comments in your decision-making" manner. Raise them as questions rather than define details.

John – Subcommittee’s comments fall on different levels – large program and details. If you want a detailed change you need to produce info as why, but OK to raise questions without needing to provide more info.

Julie – What is most helpful, what is still in play? Likes statement of values (need to act quicker).

Seth – We agonize over the best way to get where we need to get. There is a time cost to waiting on proposal. It is a judgment call on striking that balance.

Suzanne – We took out smaller buildings from 5-year cycle versus time of transaction, -think of a 10 unit building having to make changes ever five years is more difficult. City Solicitor has opined that BEUDO as written could be challenged. Adding 300 more smaller buildings we increase possibility it will be challenged.

Keith – Those buildings wont renovate every five years, they will make a larger reduction renovation to meet long-term goal.

Seth – rather that make many small changes to draft ordinance focus on one significant change.

Should we go after the worst performing buildings harder? John – there is no set performance standard. Boston and NYC did it. John – Boston allowed an easy out for ACP.

Counselor Zondervan – There is time to get things right, the Council wont vote on the ordinance at the next meeting. It will get referred to Ordinance committee, etc.

5. Member Updates

None

6. General Public Comments

None

Notes by Keren Schlomy